GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL SERIES

CLASS B, No. 6

GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL SERIES

CLASS B, No. 6

Prepared under the Supervision of the
Publication Department of the
Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute
POONA

POONA
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
1962

Government Oriental Series — Class B, No. 6

HISTORY OF DHARMAŚĀSTRA

(ANCIENT AND MEDIÆVAL RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL LAW IN INDIA)

BY

Mahāmahopādhyāya PANDURANG VAMAN KANE,
M. A., LL. M., D. Litt. (All., Poona).

National Professor of Indology ; Senior Advocate, Supreme Court of India and Advocate High Court, Bombay; Fellow of the Bombay Asiatic Society, of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and of the London School of Oriental and African Studies.

VOL. V
(PART II)

(Śāntis ; Purāṇas and Dharmaśāstra ; Tantras and Dharmaśāstra ; Pūrvamīmāṁsā and Dharmaśāstra ; Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Tarka and Dharmaśāstra ; Cosmology, Karma and Punarjanma ; Fundamental and leading characteristics of Hindu culture and civilization ; Future Trends.)

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, POONA 4

1962

Copies can be had direct from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 4 (India)

Price Rs. 60 per Copy exclusive of Postage

Pages 719–1711 of the Text and pp. I to XXII of the Epilogue printed by Shri K. G. Sharangpani, at the Aryabhushan Press, 915/1 Shivajinagar, Poona 4

and

the Prefatory matter and the Index printed by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Press, Poona 4

and

published by Dr. R. N. Dandekar, M. A., Ph. D., Hon. Secretary, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 4.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

It is with a sense of profound gratification that the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute presents to the public the second part of the fifth and last volume of the *History of Dharmaśāstra* by MM. Professor Dr. P. V. Kane, National Professor of Indology. With this part, this monumental literary project, which was conceived by the author more than thirty years ago, has been brought to a successful completion. This must, indeed, be regarded as a memorable event in the history of Indological studies and research in this country. The five volumes of the *History of Dharmaśāstra* together extend over nearly 6,500 pages and constitute an authoritative and encyclopaedic treatment of the religious and civil law of ancient and medieval India. And what is particularly remarkable is that Professor Kane has accomplished this enormous work single-handed, and that too while being fully occupied with various other literary and public activities.

For Professor Kane, the *History of Dharmaśāstra* is the crowning glory of a life of great fulfilment; and, for the Institute, it is a matter of pride and honour to be so closely associated with it.

Professor Kane is now eighty-two years of age, but his energy and enthusiasm by no means seem to be on the wane. For, he has agreed (health permitting) to prepare for the Institute a revised and enlarged edition of the first volume of the *History*, which has now almost gone out of print.

17th November, 1962
Bhandarkar O. R. Institute
Poona 4

R. N. Dandekar

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

Professor Pandurang Vaman Kane, by his monumental volumes on Dharmaśāstra, has placed us all under a deep debt of gratitude to him. His work is of lasting value. At a time when we are building an integrated Indian society, a dispassionate study of our *Dharmaśāstras* is essential. By his work we are helped to understand what is living and what is dead in the heritage which has come down to us.

Our heritage has always been changing with reference to new conditions and new pressures. The process of readaptation is now at work. In spite of many changes the obstacles to Indian unity require to be removed. The principles which should guide us in the reorientation of our society are well brought out in Professor Kane's volumes. They may be said to be religious and social.

True religion has three sides to it : (1) a state of mind ; (2) a relationship to Reality ; and (3) a way of life.

State of mind. Religious scriptures speak of the passionate quest for spiritual illumination. Religion is inner illumination, a renewal of spirit, an awakening, a changed condition of mind. This is the knowledge of God and not merely belief in Him. This is achieved by study, discipline, meditation and purity of heart.

Relationship to Reality. Nearness to God is the goal of religious aspirants. When they attain an insight into Reality, their words are full of rapturous delight. They make out that the Reality they encounter is ineffable, incapable of adequate expression.

It transcends the distinction of subject and object, the duality which is essential for knowledge.

The absolute of experience is not the absolute of language or of logic. The Real to which we belong is beyond description in its majesty, power and glory. Spiritual humility requires us to look upon the varied expressions and interpretations as suggestions of the Supreme. By encouraging dogmatism and the use of force to spread belief, religions have become discredited.

The seers affirm that they are one with the Supreme : *ahaṁ brahmāsmi*. Hallāj exclaims : "I am the truth" and was executed for his heterodoxy.

A well-known Sufi tradition attributes to the prophet a saying : "He who knows the self knows the Lord". Of Abū Yazīd it is recorded that he said : "I sloughed off my self as a snake sloughs off its skin; then I looked into my self, and lo, I was He".[1] Religion, it is said, springs from the great 'I am' in each 'me'. The fountains are within.

On the pathway to the goal we feel that the attainment of the goal is conditioned by the effort of the seeker and the grace of God — *tapaḥ-prabhāva* and *deva-prasāda*.

The seekers look upon the Supreme as a Person separate from us, whose commands we obey, whose will we accept with reverence. The One beyond sense-perception, speech and logic is also the Controller, the Lord of all, the Creator and Ordainer of all. "There is nothing marvellous in my love for you, O God, you are a mighty being but your love for me a poor slave is really marvellous. It is impossible to know thee and not to love thee." The personal is not a falsification of

---

1. Cf. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* IV. 4. 7.

the real. It is a manifestation of the Supreme. In some of the Upaniṣads — *Śvetāśvatara* for example — as in the *Bhagavadgītā*, the Supreme is a God of love and grace. Those who adopt the view of religion as experience, communion with God, are free from the tyranny of dogmas, from the fanaticism which is a disease of the mind to which men and communities are subject.

We are vulnerable to mass hysteria. This need not be so for human nature is infinitely malleable. If we feel that anything is true or beautiful, we are persuaded that it must find acceptance from others. We cannot but communicate to others what we know to be the truth. But when claims to absolute truth are varied and conflicting, humility requires us to respect the deepest convictions of others.

Way of Life. In some systems of thought a distinction is made between two orders of being, metaphysical and empirical. It does not mean that the latter is illusory. The distinction between the two is not absolute. The metaphysical reality is immanent in the world of becoming and makes for the gradual unfolding of values. This world is consecrated ground. Our sages set forth in clear and shining words the ideal of participation in the work of the world in order to raise its quality. *Karmabhūmim imām prāpya kartavyaṁ karma yat śubham* says Rāma, according to Vālmīki. Having come into this world of action one should perform good deeds. Vālmīki continues that the great sages have attained heaven through the performance of good deeds. It does not matter whether you are a *gṛhastha* or householder, *saṁnyāsin* or mendicant. Janaka was a householder, and sage Yājñavalkya was a wandering mendicant, *parivrājaka.* If we behave well, we will make the world a paradise ; if we misbehave we will turn it into hell.

Vyavasāyātmikā buddhir eke 'ha kurunandana. The trained understanding is single-minded. Integrity refers to the quality of oneness. It does not mean alienation from the world. Religion does not mean other-worldiness, separating oneself from all created things. It is denial of egoism. Turning one's back on the world is a part of ascetic discipline which is not an end in itself. Liberation from the tyranny of time is not liberation from time. When we become spiritual in outlook we do not cease to be human.

The secret of true greatness is love of fellowmen. Love of neighbour is not only a moral duty but a wise policy. The right course today is co-operation and not conflict. " What merit is there in the goodness of a man who returns good for good ? A good man verily is one who returns good for evil. "[1] *Rāmarājya* or the Kingdom of God is the ideal for the human community. The one hope for the peoples of the world to get together is a change in the human heart.

Ethical standards are the only criteria for the distinction between high and low among men. Purity of conduct elevates a man even as impurity degrades him. All other distinctions are irrelevant. The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* refers to *patitas.* The Cāṇḍālas are those given to stealing, drinking, adultery and murder. These four are fallen : *ete patanti catvāraḥ.*[2] A *patita*, a fallen man, is a wicked man, a small-minded selfish man, not an untouchable.

The caste distinctions may have had their value in another context of society but we have out-grown it.

1. *upakāriṣu yaḥ sādhuḥ sādhutve tasya ko guṇaḥ* ।
apakāriṣu yaḥ sādhuḥ sa sādhuḥ sadbhir ucyate ॥

2. V. 10. 9.

The *Bhagavadgītā* speaks of the four-fold classification as based on *guṇa* (character) and *karma* (work).

We are all unregenerate at birth and become regenerate by our effort.

janmanā jāyate śūdraḥ
saṁskārād dvija ucyate ।

Some are advanced; others not. We should give equal facilities to all. The *Mahābhārata* says that there was only one *varṇa* at the beginning and the four castes arose out of later developments.

ekavarṇam idaṁ pūrvaṁ viśvam āsīd yudhiṣṭhira ।
karma-kriyā-vibhedena cāturvarṇyaṁ pratiṣṭhitam ॥

But we have come to base caste on birth though some of our leading writers have held that it is not birth or learning but conduct alone that constitutes its basis; for *dvijatva*,

vṛttam eva tu kāraṇam ।
vedapāṭhena vipras tu brahmajñānāt tu brāhmaṇaḥ ॥

It is not the colour of the skin but the conduct of the person that counts. The only way to progress is by means of good conduct. The *Saṁvarta-Smṛti* says :

sadācāreṇa devatvam ṛṣitvaṁ vai tathaiva ca ।
prāpnuvanti kuyonitvam manuṣyās tadviparyaye ॥

Great achievement is possible for each one of us.

Professor Kane brings out with great learning and lucidity the frequent changes our society has passed through. When Manu (I. 85) tells us that different customs prevailed in different ages he suggests that the social code is not a fixed but a flexible one.[1] Social

---

1. *anye kṛtayuge dharmās tretāyāṁ dvāpare 'pare* ।
anye kaliyuge nṛṇām

customs and institutions are subject to change. Yājña-valkya tells us that "one should not practise that which, though ordained by the *Smṛti*, is condemned by the people."[1] What appeals to one's conscience, *ātmanas tuṣṭiḥ*, the conscience of the disciplined, not of the superficial, the forms which the elect praise,[2] should be our standard.

Vital changes may be introduced in the habits of the people by *pariṣads* or assemblies of the learned. When such assemblies cannot be constituted even the decision of one learned in *dharma* will be authoritative. The *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra* says : *dharmajña-samayaḥ pramāṇam.*[3] People who are learned and compassionate, who are practical-minded can decide the issues of right and wrong. They are the conscience of the community. What we are doing by legislative enactments is consistent with our tradition.

S. RADHAKRISHNAN

1. I. 156.
2. *yam āryāḥ kriyamāṇaṁ tu śaṁsanti.*
3. I. 1. 1. 2.

PREFACE TO VOLUME V

The fourth volume of the *History of Dharmaśāstra* was published in October 1953, i.e. more than eight years ago. This last volume was in the Press for more than five years. The delay is due to several causes This volume in two parts contains over 1700 pages. It is thus far more bulky than any of the previous volumes. Nonavailability of sufficient quantity of good printing paper was another cause. The third cause was my age (I am now 82 years old) and frequent bad health. It is gratifying to my friends and myself that at last this undertaking spread over thirty-seven years is completed.

This volume is divided into ten sections. The first section deals with Vratas and Utsavas (religious vows and festivals) ; the second with Kāla (time), Muhūrta (auspicious times), and calendar ; the third with Śāntis (propitiatory rites for averting the wrath of a deity, a calamity or unlucky event) ; the fourth and fifth with Purāṇas and Dharmaśāstra and the causes of the disappearance of Buddhism from India ; the sixth with Tāntrik doctrines and Dharmaśāstra ; the seventh with Mīmāṁsā and Dharmaśāstra ; the eighth with Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Tarka and Dharmaśāstra ; the ninth with cosmology, Karma and Punarjanma ; the tenth with the fundamental conceptions and characteristics of Hindu (Bhāratīya) culture and civilization, and future trends.

In the Preface to the 2nd volume I have indicated the reasons for numerous and lengthy Sanskrit quotations. In the Preface to the 4th volume I have mentioned the aim I had in view in bringing together the facts

in each branch of Dharmaśāstra with detachment and integrity and without bias. The same aim and mental attitude have been kept in view in this volume also. But it may be argued that when an author selects some of the numerous facts he passes a judgement about the importance of facts and his judgement may be biased all the same. I do not dispute this argument, but will only argue that, facts being numerous and there being limitations imposed by the space available, the author has a right to pronounce a judgement as to the importance of the facts he selects.

As regards volumes two, three and four, I could rely on a tower of strength in the person of Paramahaṁsa Svāmī Kevalānanda Sarasvatī of Wai. But, unfortunately the Svāmī passed away in March 1955 before I began to write this last volume, and I could not get the benefit of his wise counsel in this fifth volume.

In this last volume I received help from many people, either personally or by correspondence. I have to thank Mr. M. B. Arte, Dr. R. N. Dandekar, and Prof. H. D. Velankar for help in translating important passages from several French and German works. Prof. Gode, Curator of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, was always ready to render help as to manuscripts and books. He had been a close friend for nearly forty years and his sudden death has meant for me the loss of a learned, sympathetic, and ever-obliging friend. Dr. A. D. Pusalker very carefully read the chapters on Purāṇas and indicated several misprints and some inaccurate statements. Dr. Raghavan very kindly brought to my notice the calendars in use in Southern India and certain works on Vratas ; Pandit Śrījīva Nyāyatīrtha sent me in Sanskrit the Naiyāyika view on Kāla ; Miss Kunda Sathe (now Mrs. Savkar)

kindly sent me from Paris information from French scholars on Babylonian, Assyrian and Greek astronomy. I am highly obliged to Dr. B. S. Joshi for sending me microfilms of certain papers (not available in India) from Cambridge and Chicago. Prof. Durgamohan Bhattacharya kindly sent me a copy of the *Kāla-siddhānta-darśinī.* I am under deep obligations to Svāmī Kuvalayānanda of Lonavla for reading my chapter on Yoga and suggesting valuable changes and amendments. Prof. Zala gave me details about the Vratas observed in Saurāṣṭra. Prof. G. H. Bhatt (Baroda) and Mr. S. L. Katre (Curator, Scindia Institute, Ujjain) very kindly showed me the manuscript-wealth of their Institutes and helped me with the contents of several relevant mss. on Vratas and Kāla. Shri Padeśāstrī of Baroda discussed with me, personally and by correspondence, several points about Ancient Hindu Astronomy. MM. Dr. Umesh Mishra brought to my notice his edition of the *Vijñānadīpikā* of Padmapāda and Dr. H. G. Narahari wrote to me about the *Prārabdha-dhvānta-vidhvaṁsana* of Acyutarāya and sent me off-prints of his papers thereon. Mr. Shankarrao Joshi of the Bhārata Itihāsa Saṁśodhaka Maṇḍala of Poona helped me by bringing to my notice hand-written calendars more than two hundred years old. To all these I offer my best thanks. I am highly obliged to Mr. S. N. Savadi B. A. (HONS.) of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute for help in the correction of the proofs of this volume. I have to thank Mr. P. M. Purandare, Advocate (O. S.), Bombay High Court, Tarkatīrtha Raghunāthaśāstrī Kokje of Lonavla, and Dr. Bhabatosh Bhattacharya for reading the printed sheets and making suggestions and pointing out misprints. Mr. N. G. Chapekar, in spite of his being now over 91 years of age, read some chapters when they were only typewritten, and discussed them personally

with me for some hours. To him I owe a deep debt of gratitude for having taken so much trouble at such a very advanced age. I am highly obliged to Dr. A. Ghosh, Director-General of the Archaeological Survey of India, and to the Librarian Mr. L. G. Parab and the staff of the Archaeological Library for rendering all help to me while I had been collecting material for this volume.

I cannot find words adequate enough to express my sense of deep gratitude to Dr. Radhakrishnan, now President of India, who has favoured me with many kindnesses during the last fourteen years. As for this volume of the *History of Dharmaśāstra*, in the midst of numerous engagements and heavy work, he found time to look into its last two chapters, made vital suggestions for their improvement, and finally contributed a learned Foreword.

I am aware that, in spite of so much help rendered by so many friends and well-wishers, this large volume might contain many mistakes, for which I alone am responsible. In the process of printing, some diacritical marks have either been elided or placed in wrong places, for which I seek the indulgence of all scholars and readers.

Lastly, I thank the Manager of the Aryabhushan Press of Poona for carrying out with energy and zeal the work of printing this very large volume bristling with thousands of quotations, in the face of great difficulties caused by shortage of paper, the Poona floods, and other unforeseen happenings.

Bombay, July 1962 P. V. KANE.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

of some important works and authors. referred to in vol. V.

N. B. Some dates, particularly of ancient works, are more or less conjectural.

4000 B. C.–1000 B. C.—The period of the Vedic Saṁhitās, Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads; some hymns of the Ṛgveda, of the Atharvaveda and verses in the Taittirīya Saṁhitā and Brāhmaṇas may possibly go back to a period earlier than 4000 B. C. and some of the Upaniṣads (even from among those that are regarded by most scholars as the earliest ones) may be later than 1000 B. C.. Some scholars have criticized me for assigning the Vedic Saṁhitās to such an early date as 4000 B. C. Bloomfield, in 'Religion of the Veda' (New York, 1908) was willing (on p. 20) to regard 2000 B. C. for the beginnings of Vedic literary productions and to assign a much earlier date for institutions and religious concepts which the Veda derived and he denies that there is any better proof for any later date such as 1500, 1200 or 1000 B. C. rather than for one of the earlier viz. 2000 B. C. Winternitz (in 'Some problems of Indian Literature' which are his Calcutta Readership Lectures, p. 20) remarks 'it is more probable that this unknown time of the Vedic Literature was nearer 2500 B. C. or 2000 B. C. than to 1500 or 1200 B. C.' Both Bloomfield and Winternitz frankly confess that they know nothing at all about the date of the early Vedic Literature. Some Western scholars are rather too cocksure or dogmatic than the facts warrant.

They mostly rely on comparisons with other extant Indo-Aryan literatures and conjectures, which is *not* proof.

800 B. C.-500 B. C—The Nirukta of Yāska.

800 B. C.-400 B. C.—The principal Śrauta sūtras (such as those of Āśvalāyana, Āpastamba, Baudhāyana, Kātyāyana and Satyāṣāḍha) and some of the Gṛhyasūtras (such as those of Āśvalāyana and Āpastamba) and Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa.

500 B. C.-300 B. C.—The Dharmasūtras of Gautama, Āpastamba, Baudhāyana and Vasiṣṭha and the Gṛhyasūtras of Pāraskara and a few others.

500 B. C.-300 B. C.—Pāṇini.

500 B. C.-200 B. C.—The Bhagavad-gītā.

400 B. C.-200 B. C.—The Pūrvmīmāṁsā-sūtra of Jaimini.

300 B. C.-200 B. C.—The Vārtikas of Vararuci Kātyāyana on Pāṇini's Grammar.

300 B. C.-100 A. D.—The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya (rather nearer the former date than the latter).

200 B. C.-100 A. D.—The Manusmṛti.

150 B. C.-100 A. D.—The Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali (rather nearer the former date than the latter).

100 B. C.-100 A. D.—Upavarṣa, author of a commentary on Pūrvamīmāṁsā and Vedāntasūtra.

100 B. C.-300 A. D.—Patañjali, author of Yogasūtra.

100 A. D.-300 A. D.—Yājñavalkya-smṛti and the Viṣṇudharmasūtra.

100 A. D.-400 A. D.—Nāradasmṛti.

200 A. D.-400 A. D.—Śabara, author of bhāṣya on P. M. S. (nearer the former date than the latter).

250 A. D.-325 A. D.—Sāṅkhyakārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa.

300 A. D.-500 A. D.—Bṛhaspatismṛti on Vyavahāra

and other topics (not yet found); extracts on Vyavahāra are translated in S. B. E. Vol. 33 and extracts from Bṛhaspatismṛti on many topics were collected by Prof. Rangaswami Aiyangar and published in a volume in G. O. S.

300 A. D.-600 A. D.—some of the extant Purāṇas such as Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu, Matsya, Mārkaṇḍeya.

400 A. D.-500 A. D.—Māṭharavṛtti on Sāṅkhyakārikā.

400 A. D.-500 A. D.—The Yogasūtrabhāṣya of Vyāsa.

476 A. D.-Āryabhaṭa, author of Āryabhaṭīyam, was born.

500 A. D.-575 A. D.—Varāhamihira, author of Bṛhatsaṁhitā, Bṛhajjātaka, Pañcasiddhāntikā and other works.

550 A. D.-700 A. D.—Yuktidīpikā, com. on Sāṅkhyakārikā.

600 A. D.-650 A. D.—Bāṇa, author of the Kādambarī and Harṣacarita.

650 A. D.-660 A. D.—Kāśikā of Vāmana and Jayāditya, com. on Pāṇini's grammar (was composed)

650 A. D.-700 A. D.—Kumārilabhaṭṭa, author of Ślokavārtika, Tantravārtika, Ṭupṭīkā.

600 A. D.-900 A. D.—Most of the metrical smṛtis such as those of Parāśara, Śaṅkha and Devala and some of the Purāṇas like Viṣṇudharmottara, Agni, Garuḍa.

680 A. D.-725 A. D.—Maṇḍana (vide p. 1198 of vol. V).

700 A. D.-750 A. D.—Gauḍapāda, author of a commentary on Sāṅkhyakārikā and *paramaguru* (guru's guru) of Śaṅkarācārya.

700 A. D.-750 A. D—Umbeka; vide vol. V p. 1198

710 A. D.-770 A. D.—Śālikanātha (vide vol. V p. 1198)

788 A. D.-820 A. D.—Śaṅkarācārya, author of Bhāṣyas on the Gītā, principal Upaniṣads and V. S.

780 A. D.-870 A. D.—Utpala, the encyclopedic commentator on Varāhamihira's works.

790 A. D.-850 A. D.—Viśvarūpa, the commentator of Yājñavalkyasmṛti, author of Vārtika on the Bhāṣyas of Śaṅkarācārya on Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad and the Taittirīyopaniṣad and of the Naiṣkarmyasiddhi; the same as Sureśvara (after he became a Sannyāsin).

820 A. D.-900 A. D.—Vācaspati, author of bhāṣya on Yogasūtra, author of Nyāyakaṇikā, Tattvasamīkṣā, Bhāmatī (in all 7 works).

825 A. D.-900 A. D.—Medhātithi, author of bhāṣya on the Manusmṛti.

900 A. D.-1100 A. D.—Pārthasārathimiśra, author of Śāstradīpikā, Tantraratna, Nyāyaratnākara.

1005 A. D.-1055 A. D.—Dhāreśvara Bhoja, author of numerous works such as the Rājamārtaṇḍa (on astrology), Yuktikalpataru, Rājamārtaṇḍa (a commentary on Yogasūtra).

1050 A. D.-1150 A. D.—Bhavanātha or Bhavadeva, author of Nayaviveka.

1080 A. D.-1100 A. D.—Vijñāneśvara, author of Mitākṣarā, commentary on Yāj.

1100 A. D.-1130 A. D.—Lakṣmīdhara, author of a very extensive digest on Dharmaśāstra called Kalpataru or Kṛtyakalpataru.

1100 A. D.-1130 A. D.—Aparārka, a Śilāhāra king, author of an extensive commentary on Yāj.

1100 A. D.-1150 A. D.—Jīmūtavāhana, author of Dāyabhāga, Kālaviveka and Vyavahāramātṛkā.

1127 A. D.-1138 A. D.—Mānasollāsa or Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi of Someśvaradeva.

1114 A. D.-1183 A. D.—Bhāskarācārya, author of Siddhāntaśiromaṇi (born in 1114 A. D.).

1150 A. D. - 1160 A. D.—Rājataraṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa (composed between these dates).

1150 A. D.-1180 A. D.—Aniruddhabhaṭṭa, author of Hāralatā and Pitṛdayitā and *guru* of Ballālasena, king of Bengal.

1158 A. D.-1183 A D.—Ballālasena (king of Bengal who composed five works of which two are available and printed viz. Adbhutasāgara (begun in 1168 A. D.) and the Dānasāgara composed in 1169 A. D.

1150 A. D.-1300 A. D.—Haradatta, commentator of Dharmasūtras of Gautama and Āpastamba and of some Gṛhyasūtras.

1150 A. D.-1300 A. D.—Kullūka, commentator of Manusmṛti.

1200 A. D.-1225 A. D.—Smṛticandrikā of Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa.

1260 A. D.-1270 A. D.—Caturvargacintāmaṇi of Hemādri (composed between these dates).

1275 A. D.-1310 A. D.—Śrīdatta, author of Pitṛbhakti, Samayapradīpa and other works.

1300 A. D.-1370 A. D.—Caṇḍeśvara, author of Gṛhastharatnākara, Kṛtyaratnākara, Vyavahāraratnākara and other works.

1300 A. D.-1386 A. D.—Mādhavācārya, author of Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvistāra, Parāśaramādhavīya and other works.

1300 A. D.-1386 A. D.—Sāyaṇa, author of bhāṣyas of Vedic Saṁhitās and Brāhmaṇas.

1360 A. D.-1390 A. D.—Madanapārijāta and Mahārṇavaprakāśa compiled under king Madanapāla and his son.

1360 A. D.-1448 A. D.—These are the dates of the

birth and death of Vidyāpati, author of Gaṅgāvākyāvali and other works, patronized by several kings of Mithilā.

1375 A. D.–1450 A. D.—Śūlapāṇi, author of Dīpakalikā, Tithiviveka, Ekādaśīviveka and several works on topics of Dharmaśāstra called Vivekas.

1425 A. D.–1450 A. D.—King Madanasiṁha, completed a large digest called Madanaratna.

1375 A. D.–1500 A. D.—Digest composed by Pṛthvīcandra, son of Nāgamalla, called Dharmatattvasudhānidhi.

1400 A. D.–1450 A. D.—Nyāyasudhā of Someśvara, a commentary on Tantravārtika.

1425 A. D.–1460 A. D.—Rudradhara, author of Varṣakṛtya, Śuddhiviveka and other works.

1425 A. D.–1490 A. D.—Vācaspati, author of Kṛtyacintāmaṇi and numerous works called Cintāmaṇi and some works called Nirṇaya (e. g. Tithinirṇaya).

1440 A. D.–1500 A. D.—Vardhamāna, author of Daṇḍaviveka, Gaṅgākṛtyaviveka and other works.

1513 A. D.–1580 A. D.—Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, author of Tristhalīsetu, Prayogaratna etc.

1520 A. D.–1575 A. D.—Raghunandana, author of many works called Tattvas, such as Tithitattva, Ekādaśītattva etc.

1554 A. D.–1626 A. D.—Appayyadīkṣita, author of Vidhirasāyana and numerous works on different śāstras and topics (vide p. 1199 above).

1560 A. D.–1620 A. D.—Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa, son of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa and author of Dvaitanirṇaya, Mīmāṁsābālaprakāśa and other works.

1590 A. D.–1630 A. D.—Nandapaṇḍita, author of Dvaitanirṇaya, Vaijayantī (commentary on Viṣṇudharmasūtra).

1600 A. D.–1665 A. D.—Khaṇḍadeva, author of Bhāṭṭakaustubha and Bhāṭṭadīpikā.

1610 A. D.–1640 A. D.—Time of literary activity of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa, author of Nirṇayasindhu, Śūdrakamalākara and many other works.

1610 A. D.–1640 A. D.—Mitramiśra, author of a huge digest called Vīramitrodaya on tīrtha, pūjā, samaya and many other topics of Dharmaśāstra.

1615 A. D.–1645 A. D.—Time of literary activity of Nīlakaṇṭha, son of Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa, and author of a digest on topics of Ācāra, Saṁskāra, Vyavahāra etc.

1620 A. D.–1690 A. D.—Viśveśvara, alias Gāgābhaṭṭa, author of Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi and other works.

1645 A. D.–1675 A. D.—Probable period of the literary activity of Anantadeva, author of a large digest called Smṛtikaustubha.

1700 A. D.–1740 A. D.—Smṛtimuktāphala of Vaidyanātha.

1670 A. D.–1750 A. D.—Nāgeśa or Nāgojibhaṭṭa, an encyclopædic writer on Grammar, Poetics, Dharmaśāstra, Yoga and other Śāstras (about 47 works).

1790 A. D.—date of the composition of the Dharmasindhu by Kāśīnātha Upādhyāya.

1730 A. D.–1820 A. D.—Bālambhaṭṭa, author of a commentary called Bālambhaṭṭī on the Mitākṣarā.

ABBREVIATIONS

used in vol. V for works in English and Sanskrit.

On pp. 251–252 there is a list of abbreviations meant for the list of Vratas alone. Many of them will be included in this list also.

A. B. O. R. I. = Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

AIHT = "Ancient Indian Historical Tradition" by Pargiter.

Ait. Br. = Aitareya-brāhmaṇa.

A. I. O. C. = All India Oriental Conference.

A. K. = Ahalyā-kāmadhenu (ms.)

Āp Dh. S. = Āpastambadharmasūtra.

Āp. Śr. S. = Āpastamba Śrautasūtra.

Āśv. Gṛ. = Āśvalāyana Gṛhya-sūtra.

A. S. W. I. = Archaeological Survey of Western India Reports.

B. D. C. R. I. = Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona.

B. E. = 'Buddhist Esoterism' by Dr. B. Bhattacharya.

B. E. F. E. O. = Bulletin de L'Ecole Francaise D' Extreme-Orient.

B. G. = Bombay Gazetteer Volumes.

B. G. S. = Bombay Government Series.

Bhav. U. = Bhaviṣyottara-purāṇa.

B. I. = Bibliotheca Indica Series.

B. O. R. I. = Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

Br. = Brāhmaṇa (class of works).

Bṛ. S. = Bṛhat-saṁhitā of Varāhamihira.

Bṛ. Up. = Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.

B. V. = Bhāratīya Vidyā, Journal, Bombay.

C. I. I. = Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum; Vol. I Aśoka Inscriptions; Vol. II Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions; Vol. III Gupta Inscriptions; Vol. IV Kalacūri Inscriptions.

C. R. C. = Calendar Reform Committee (Report of).

D. C. = Deccan College.

E. I. = Epigraphia Indica (Volumes).

E. R. E. = Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics in 12 volumes.

E. S. A. = ' Exact Sciences in Antiquity ' by Prof. Neugebauer (1951).

Gaut. or Gautama = Gautama-dharmasūtra.

G. K. = Kālasāra of Gadādhara.

G. O. S. = Gaikwad's Oriental Series (Baroda).

H. = Prof. Hazra.

H. of Dh. or H. Dh. = History of Dharmaśāstra, Vols. I–V.

H. O. S. = Harvard Oriental Seiies.

H. P. or H. Y. P. = Haṭhayogapradīpikā.

H. V. = Hemādri on Vratas.

I. A = Indian Antiquary (Journal) or Law Reports, Indian Appeals (context will clearly show which is meant).

I. H. Q. = Indian Historical Quarterly (Journal).

Jai. = Jaimini or Jaimini's Pūrvamīmāṁsā-sūtra.

J. A. O. S = Journal of the American Oriental Society.

J. A. S. or J. A. S. B. = Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

J. B. A. S. = Journal of the Asiatic Society, Bombay.

J. B. B. R. A. S. = Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

J. B. H. U. = Journal of the Benaras Hindu University

J. B. O. R. S. = Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.

J. B. R. S. = Journal of the Bihar Research Society.

J. G. J. R. I. = Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute, Allahabad.

J. I. H. = Journal of Indian History.

Jiv. = Jivananda's edition in two volumes of Raghunandana's Tattvas.

J. N. = Jayantīnirṇaya.

J. U. P. H. S. = Journal of United Provinces Historical Society.

J. O. R. = Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.

J. R. A. S. = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain.

J. V. O. T. = Journal of Venkatesvara Oriental Institute

K. N. = Kālanirṇaya of Mādhava.

K. R = Kṛtyaratnākara of Caṇḍeśvara.

K. S. S. = Kashi Sanskrit Series.

K. T. = Kṛtyatattva.

K. T. V. = Kālatattvavivecana.

K. V. = Kālaviveka.

M. B. P. = Mīmāṁsā-bāla-prakāśa.

M. C. = Muhūrta-cintāmaṇi.

M. L. J. = Madras Law Journal.

Mit. = Mitākṣarā, commentary on Yājñavalkya-smṛti.

M. M. = Mahāmahopādhyāya (title conferred on learned men).

M. M. = Muhūrtamārtaṇḍa (a work).

Nir. or. Nirṇ. = Nirṇayasāgara Press edition.

N. I. A. = New Indian Antiquary (a journal).

N. S. = Nirṇayasindhu.

Pār. Gṛ. = Pāraskara-gṛhya-sūtra.

P. C. = Puruṣārtha-cintāmaṇi.

Ph. Up. = Philosophy of the Upanishads by Paul Deussen, translated by A. S. Geden.

P. M. = Pūrvamīmāṁsā.

P. M. S. = Pūrvamīmāṁsā-śāstra or sūtra (according to context).

P. O. = Poona Orientalist (journal).

P. R. H. R. = Studies in Purāṇik Records on Hindu rites and customs (collection of 16 papers by Prof. Hazra).

Ṛg. = Ṛgveda.

R. M. = Rājamārtaṇḍa of Bhoja (Ms. in B. O. R. I.).

R. N. P. = Rājanītiprakāśa of Caṇḍeśvara.

Śāṅ. Śr. S. = Śāṅkhāyana-śrauta sūtra.

Śat. Br. = Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (ed. by Weber).

S. B. E. = Sacred Books of the East Series (ed. by MaxMuller).

S. M. = Samayamayūkha of Nīlakaṇṭha.

Sm. C. = Smṛti-candrikā (ed. by Mr. Gharpure).

Sm. K. = Smṛtikaustubha.

Tai. Ā. or T. A. = Taittirīya Āraṇyaka.

Tai. Br. = Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa.

Tai. S. or T. S. = Taittirīya-Saṁhitā.

Tai. Up. = Taittirīya Upaniṣad.

T. S. S. = Trivandrum Sanskrit Series.

T. T. = Tithitattva of Raghunandana.

U. = Upapurāṇa.

Up. = Upaniṣad.

Vāj. S. = Vājasaneya Saṁhitā.

Var. = Varāhapurāṇa.

Varāha = Varāhamihira.

V. Dh. or Viṣṇu Dh. S. = Viṣṇudharmasūtra.

Vi. Dh. = Viṣṇu-Dharmottara-purāṇa.

V. K. K. = Varṣa-kriyā-kaumudī.

V. K. R. = Varṣakṛtya of Rudradhara.

V. S. = Vedāntasūtra of Bādarāyaṇa.

Y. S. = Yogasūtra.

Yāj. = Yājñavalkya-smṛti.

अ. का.
अ. का. धे. } = अहल्याकामधेनु (Ms. in Scindia Institute, Ujjain)

अग्नि.
अग्निपु. } = *अग्निपुराण (आनन्दाश्रम ed.)*

अथर्व. = अथर्ववेद (ed. by Pandit Satavalekar)

अपरार्क. = Com. of, on या. स्मृति (आनन्दाश्रम ed.)

अ. सा. = अद्भुतसागर of बल्लालसेन (Calcutta, 1905)

आप. गृ. = आपस्तम्बगृह्यसूत्र

आप. ध. सू. = आपस्तम्बधर्मसूत्र

आप. श्रौ. = आपस्तम्बश्रौतसूत्र

आश्व. गृ. = आश्वलायनगृह्यसूत्र

आश्व श्रौ.
आश्व. श्रौ. सू. } = आश्वलायनश्रौतसूत्र

ऋ. = ऋग्वेद

ए. त. = एकादशीतत्त्व

ऐ. ब्रा. = ऐतरेयब्राह्मण

कल्प.
कल्पतरु. } = कृत्यकल्पतरु of लक्ष्मीधर (separate volumes on गृहस्थ, नैयतकाल, मोक्ष, व्रत etc.) ed. in G. O. S.

का. त. वि. = कालतत्त्वविवेचन

का. नि. = कालनिर्णय of माधवाचार्य

का वि. = कालविवेक of जीमूतवाहन

कृ. त. = कृत्यतत्त्व of रघुनन्दन

कृ. र.
कृत्यर. } = कृत्यरत्नाकर of चण्डेश्वर (B. I. Series)

कौ. ब्रा. = कौषीतकिब्राह्मण

गरुड = गरुडपुराण

गौ.
गौ. ध. सू.
गौतम } = गौतमधर्मसूत्र (आनन्दाश्रम ed. with com. of हरदत्त)

छा.
छा. उ. } = छान्दोग्योपनिषद्

जै. = पूर्वमीमांसासूत्र of जैमिनि (आनन्दाश्रम ed.)

ति. त. = तिथितत्त्व of रघुनन्दन

तै. आ. = तैत्तिरीयारण्यक

तै. उ.
तै. उप. } = तैत्तिरीयोपनिषद्

तै. ब्रा. = तैत्तिरीयब्राह्मण (आनन्दाश्रम ed.)

तै. सं. = तैत्तिरीयसंहिता (ed. by Pandit Satavalekar)

दुर्गार्च०
दुर्गार्चन० } = दुर्गार्चनपद्धति of रघुनन्दन

दु. भ. त. = दुर्गाभक्तितरङ्गिणी of विद्यापति (ed. at Darbhanga, 1900)

द्वै. नि. सि. सं. = द्वैतनिर्णयसिद्धान्तसंग्रह

ध. सि. = धर्मसिन्धु of काशीनाथ (ed. of 1926, with Marathi translation) Nir. ed.

नि. सि. = निर्णयसिन्धु (with Marathi translation) Nir. ed.

न्यायमञ्जरी = Kashi S. Series

पञ्चसि. = पञ्चसिद्धान्तिका of वराहमिहिर (ed. by Thibaut and Dwivedi)

पद्म०
पद्मपु. } = पद्मपुराण (आनन्दाश्रम ed.)

परा. मा. = पराशरमाधवीय (Bombay S. Series)

पा. = पाणिनि's अष्टाध्यायी

पु. चि. = पुरुषार्थचिन्तामणि

प्राय. त. = प्रायश्चित्ततत्त्व of रघुनन्दन

प्राय. म. = प्रायश्चित्तमयूख of नीलकण्ठ

बृह. उ.
बृह. उप. } = बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्

बृहत्सं. = बृहत्संहिता of वराहमिहिर (ed. by Kern, only **text**; **by** सुधाकर द्विवेदिन्, with com. of उत्पल. **There is a** difference of one chap. between the two editions).

बृहद्योगि. = बृहद्योगियाज्ञवल्क्य (ed. by स्वामी कुवलयानन्द of Lonavla)

बौ. गृ. = बौधायनगृह्यसूत्र

ब्रह्म
ब्रह्मपु. } = ब्रह्मपुराण (आनन्दाश्रम ed.)

भविष्य = भविष्यपुराण

मद. पा. = मदनपारिजात (B. I. Series)

मनु = मनुस्मृति (Nirn. ed.)

मार्क. = मार्कण्डेयपुराण (Venk. ed. and Cal. ed. differ by two or three chapters)

मिता. = मिताक्षरा (टीका on याज्ञ. स्मृति, Nirn. ed.)

मी. प. = मीमांसापरिभाषा of कृष्णयज्वन् (निर्णय. ed.)

मी. बा. प्र. = मीमांसाबालप्रकाश of शङ्करभट्ट (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series)

मु. चि. = मुहूर्तचिन्तामणि

मेधा. = मेधातिथि's commentary on मनुस्मृति

मै. सं = मैत्रायणीसंहिता (ed. by Pandit Sātavalekar)

या.
याज्ञ. } = याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृति (निर्णयसागर ed. with मिताक्षरा)

यो. सू. = योगसूत्र

रा. मा. = राजमार्तण्ड of भोज

व. क्रि. कौ. = वर्षक्रियाकौमुदी of गोविन्दानन्द (B. I. ed.)

वन. = वनपर्व (of महाभारत)

वराह. = वराहमिहिर or वराहपुराण acc. to context

वाज. सं. = वाजसनेयसंहिता (ed. by Pandit Sātavaḷekar)

वामन° = वामनपुराण

वि. दी. = विज्ञानदीपिका

वी. मि. = वीरमित्रोदय of मित्रमिश्र

वे. सू. = वेदान्तसूत्र of बादरायण with शाङ्करभाष्य (निर्णय. ed.)

व्य. म. = व्यवहारमयूख of नीलकण्ठ

व्र. का. वि. = व्रतकालविवेक

व्रत. प्र. } = व्रतप्रकाश, part of वीरमित्रोदय
व्र. प्र. }

शत. ब्रा. } = शतपथ ब्राह्मण (ed. by Weber)
शतपथ }

शां. ब्रा. = शाङ्खायन ब्राह्मण

शां. श्रौ. = शाङ्खायन श्रौतसूत्र

शुद्धिकौ. = शुद्धिकौमुदी of गोविन्दानन्द (B. I. ed.)

श्वे. उप. = श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषद्

सं. कौ. = संस्कारकौस्तुभ of अनन्तदेव (Baroda ed. 1914)

स. प्र. = समयप्रकाश (part of वीरमित्रोदय)

स. म. = समयमयूख (Gujarati Press ed.)

सि. कौ. = सिद्धान्तकौमुदी of भट्टोजिदीक्षित (निर्णय. ed.)

स्कन्द. = स्कन्दपुराण (Venk. Press ed.)

स्मृतिकौ. = स्मृतिकौस्तुभ of अनन्तदेव

स्मृतिच. = स्मृतिचन्द्रिका (ed. by Mr. Gharpure)

ह. यो. प्र. = हठयोगप्रदीपिका

हे. = हेमाद्रि, author of चतुर्वर्गचिन्तामणि (B. I. ed.) on व्रत, काल, श्राद्ध, दान etc.

BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF THE CONTENTS OF VOLUME V

Pages

References to pages of important works consulted

In former volumes lists of important works consulted were set out at length. It is not necessary to do this in this volume because in each section lists of important Sanskrit works and English works and papers have been provided. Therefore, all that need be done is to bring together the pages of this volume where such lists are mostly mentioned.

Section		Works in Sanskrit pp.	Works and papers in English pp.
I.	Vrata	59, 251-52	60
II.	*Kāla*		
	Astronomy and Mathematics.		483-485, 565-66, 570-71, 581-82, 585,
	Works on Jātaka and Muhūrta.	556-559, 585, 591-594, 611-12, 616-17	594-600, 644-646
III.	Śāntis	749, 752-53, 763, 779-781, 790, 805-06	735n, 782
IV.	Purāṇas	867-869	843-845, 849, 852, 864ff, 883, 886, 909, 941-42 (on Buddhism)
V.	Purāṇas pp. 913-1033	952, 957-958 (on bhakti), 998 (on Avatāras)	969, 978, 1003 and 1008-9 (on Buddhism and causes of its disappearance from India)

Section	Works in Sanskrit pp.	Works and papers in English pp.
VI. Tantra (1033-1151)	1050-51 1140-1147	1040, 1048n (Śākta doctrines) 1148-1151
VII. Mīmāṁsā and Dharmaśāstra	1188-89 1197-1200	1200-1201
VIII. Relation of Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Tarka to Dharmaśāstra (1352-1482)		
Sāṅkhya (1352-1384)		1353n
Yoga	1394	1392-1394 1455-1456
IX. Cosmology, Karma and Punarjanma		
Cosmology (1483-1529)		1485n, 1502
Karma and Punarjanma (pp. 1530-1612)	1599-1604	1604-5
X. Fundamental conceptions and characteristics of Hindu Culture and Civilization (1613-1657)	1624, 1627-31, 1642, 1646, 1649	1618, 1648n, 1650n 1653-1657
Future trends	1704-5, 1707-11	1659-1661, 1666, 1675-76, 1683, 1695-96, 1711

CORRECTIONS

Mistakes that can be easily detected and misprints due to the loss or displacement of such loose parts as *anusvāras* or *mātrās* or diacritical dots (as under ṭ) that can be easily detected have generally not been included in this list.

Page	Line or note	
384	20	read 'on Śu 7th ; when'
494	n. 719, l. 7	read 'from' for 'form'
„	n. 722, l. 2 from bottom	read 'Gandharva'.
530	n. 765, l. 2 from bottom	read 'p. 270'
560	n. 832, l. 3	read '101 (in Kern's ed.)' for '160'
598		the figures in the photo of 'Dhanus' and 'Mīna or Makara' are wrong, in position. They should be turned upside down
647	n. 991, l. 3 from bottom	read '14' for '29'
660	l. 11	read '*akṣara a*'
696	l. 9	read 'Manu IX. 301'
715	n. 1130, l. 2	read 'purposes'
„	n. 1130, l. 3	read 'deemed'
724	n. 1145, l. 3	read शमीष्वं
736	n. 1172a, l. 2	read 1690 for 1598.
737	n. 1172b, l. 8	read 'Viṣṇor-nu kam'.
751	l. 4	read 'specified on preceding page' for 'specified below'.
801	n. 1300, l. 8	omit 'शाकुन्तल'.
813	n. 1323, l. 3	read 'रुद्रैकादशिनीति'

817	n. 1328, l. 1	read ‘ श्लोकानुदाहरन्ति ’
824	n. 1347, l. 4	read मृदुक्रूरे
833	n. 1356, l. 3	read सर्ववाञ्छाफलप्रदम्.
844	n. 1375, l. 6	read ‘ tonal ’.
870	l. 5	read ‘ It ’ for ‘ If ’
888	n. 1414b, l. 1	read ‘ Kālikā 92. 2 ’
899	l. 2	read ‘ Amar Nath Ray ’ for ‘ M. R. Majumdar ’.
911	l. 13	read ‘ Saura ’
”	l. 16	read ‘ Skanda ’
”	l. 22	read ‘ Sūtasaṁhitā ’
970	l. 8	omit ‘ way ’
”	l. 11	read ‘ way ’ for ‘ away ’
1019	l. 4 from bottom	read ‘ it is found that it condemned ’
1038	n. 1673, l. 4	put a comma after ‘ Pūrṇa ’.
1066	last note is ‘ 1724 ’ and not ‘ 1924 ’	
1103	l. 5	read ‘ neuter ’ for ‘ neither ’
1104	n. l. 2	read धारणीऽ for धारणाऽ.
1105	n. 1794, l. 3	read ‘ तज्ज्ञो ’
1156	n. 1879, l. 7	read ‘ पञ्चनखाश्चाशल्यक-, ’
1169	n. 1901, last line	read 2238 for 2186.
1174	l. 8	read ‘ note 2052 ’ for note 2010.
1196	l. 13 from bottom	put a comma after Kumārila’s
1203	n. 1954, l. 2	read ‘ सानित्या ’ (= सा अनित्या).
1221	n. 1981, l. 5	read वृत्तादिवशन्यावृत्त्यर्थे.
1226	lines 25–26	read ‘ vidhi-lin ’.
1231	l. 13	read ‘ *Soma* ’
1239	n. 2015	read शूर्पं.
1242	n. 2016, l. 3	read परप्रवक्तृकार्यादि°
1244	n. 2019, l. 1	read ये पुरस्ताच्छ्रूयन्ते.
1264	n. 2058, l. 4	read परिह्रियन्ते.

1274	n. 2077, l. 7	read 'paribhāṣas'.
1293	n. 2116, l. 3	read '°शकुनौ'.
1295	n. 2119, l. 3	read 'निविशेतोत क्रये'.
1300	l. 29	read '1238' for '1258'.
1315	n. 2164, ll. 4–5	read 'मुख्यक्रमेण वाङ्गानां तदर्थत्वात्' and omit वा after V. 1. 14
1356	l. 15	read 2238 for 2186
1373	l. 29	read 'sixty' for 'six'
1409	n. 2134, ll. 1–2	read यो. सू. I. 2–4
1432	last line	read 'prāṇād-apānatī'
1446	n. 2371	read तत्रैकचित्तता ध्यानं (separate words)
1448	n. 2382, l. 9	read शङ्खस्मृति.
1449	n. 2383, l. 6	कस्मात्, l. 7 योगसुधाकर, l. 9 असंप्रज्ञात.
1453	n. 2389, l. 8	read levitation and n. 2390 l. 8 put a semicolon after °प्रवेशः
1460	n. 2402, last line	read °नृजवे
„	n. 2413, l. 1	read भवेद्वीर्य°
1483	n. 2429, ll. 1 and 6	read Westaway
1488	n. 2439, l. 1	read कतमत्स्वित्
1494	n. 2445, l. 2	read कियता स्कम्भः and in last line व्यचो हितम्
1508	n. 2462, l. 5	read छा. उप. VI. 11. 3
1559	n. 2528, last line	read IV. 11
1615	l. 2 from bottom,	read 'Bagby's'
„	n. 2602, l. 3 from bottom,	read 'unrelated
1671	lines 4–5	read 'being sweeping ones at one stroke are likely'.
1684	l. 1	read p. 9
1708	n. 2659 l. 2	read 'What Vedānta means to me,' a symposium.

SECTION III

ŚĀNTI (Propitiatory rites for averting a deity's wrath, a calamity or unlucky event).

CHAPTER XX

Vedic meaning and procedure of Śāntis

The word Śānti is derived from the root 'śam', which has several meanings (such as 'to stop', 'to be appeased', 'to kill' rarely) and belongs to the 4th conjugation and also to the 9th. The word Śānti itself does not occur in the Ṛgveda, but it occurs in the Atharvaveda and the Vājasaneya Saṁhitā. The root 'śam', its several forms and derivatives and the indeclinable particle 'śam' occur hundreds of times even in the Ṛgveda. The word 'śam' is often conjoined in the Ṛgveda to 'yoḥ' either as 'śaṁyoḥ' (Ṛg. I. 93.7, I. 106.5, III 17.3, III. 18.4, IV. 12.5, V. 47.7, V. 53.14, V. 69.3, VI. 50.7, VII. 35.1, VII. 69.5, X. 9.4, X. 15.4, X. 37.11, X. 182.1–3) or as 'śam ca yośca' (as in Ṛg. I. 114.2, 189.2, II. 33.13, VIII. 39.4, VIII. 71.15). In these places the words are generally rendered as 'happiness and welfare' or 'health and wealth' (by Keith in translation of Tai. S. II. 6.10.3) and these meanings generally suit the context, e. g. in Ṛg. VI. 50.7 'dhāta tokāya tanayāya śaṁ yoḥ' (confer on our sons and progeny happiness and welfare), in Ṛg. X. 182 the words 'athā karad-yajamānāya śaṁ yoḥ' (may Bṛhaspati confer happiness and welfare on the sacrificer) occur as the last quarter of all the three verses. 'Śam' by itself occurs about 160 times in the Ṛgveda and it is somewhat remarkable that in Ṛg. VII. 35. 1–13 [1132] the word śam occurs in each verse from 4 to 7 times (68 times in all). Ṛg. I. 114. 1 [1133] 'we bring these lauds to Rudra who is powerful, who has braided hair, who rules over valiant men, so that there may result welfare to our two-footed and four-footed beings and every thing in this village may be prosperous and free from distress' will bring out the import of

---

1132. Verses 1–10 of Ṛg. VII. 35 are the same as Atharva 19.10 1–10.

1133. इमा रुद्राय तवसे कपर्दिने क्षयद्वीराय प्र भरामहे मतीः। यथा शमसद् द्विपदे चतुष्पदे विश्वं पुष्टं ग्रामे अस्मिन्ननातुरम्॥ ऋ. I. 114. 1.

'śam'. In some cases 'śam' and 'yoḥ' clearly appear to be employed like nouns in the objective case. For example, Ṛg. II. 33. 13 [1134] "I hanker after the 'sam' and 'yoḥ' of Rudra (i. e. under the power of Rudra), Ṛg. I. 114.2 "O Rudra! may we secure by your guidance that 'śam' and 'yoḥ' that father Manu procured through sacrifice". Yāska (Nirukta IV. 21) while dealing with Ṛg. X. 15. 4 'athā naḥ śam yor-arapo dadhāta' holds 'śamyoḥ' to be ablative or genitive of śaṁyu and explains as 'śamanam ca rogāṇām yāvanam ca bhayānām' (allaying of diseases and warding off of dangers). This is an etymological explanation and is in some cases accepted by Sāyaṇa and in others he paraphrases 'śam' by 'sukha' (happiness) and 'yoḥ' as 'duḥkha-viyoga' (freedom from pain or distress). The word 'yoḥ' presents the appearance of the ablative or genitive singular of a noun from the root 'yu' which means 'to bind' or 'separate' or from 'yā' to go. 'Yoḥ' by itself occurs only three times in the Ṛgveda (i. e. in I. 74. 7, X. 105. 3, X. 176. 3). The meaning of 'yoḥ' in these three cases is doubtful. In the Tai. Br. [1135] we have the mantra 'we choose that happiness and welfare and success (or progress) to the sacrifice and the sacrificer; may divine fortune be ours; let there be good fortune for (our) men; may medicine (or remedy) go up; may there be happiness to our men and quadrupeds'.

In Atharvaveda 19. 9 the word śānti occurs about 17 times. In verses 3 to 5 speech (vāk), the mind (manaḥ) [1136] and the five senses are referred to and it is said that these seven usually produce what is *ghora* (terrible or inauspicious) and these same must exert themselves for producing śānti (i. e. appeasement of angered deities or averting calamities or misfortunes). Verses 6–11 pray to several gods, planets (grahāḥ), the earth, falling stars, cows, the nakṣatras, magical rites, Rāhu, Dhūmaketu (comets), the Rudras, Vasus and Ādityas, sages and Bṛhaspati to confer happiness. Verse 12 prays to Indra, Brahmā, and all

---

1134. शं च योश्च रुद्रस्य वश्मि । ऋ. II. 33. 13; यच्छं च योश्च मनुरायेजे पिता तदश्याम तव रुद्र प्रणीतिषु ॥ ऋ. I. 114. 2.

1135. तच्छंयोरावृणीमहे । गातुं यज्ञाय । गातुं यज्ञपतये । दैवी स्वस्तिरस्तु नः । स्वस्तिर्मानुषेभ्यः । ऊर्ध्वं जिगातु भेषजम् । शं नो अस्तु द्विपदे शं चतुष्पदे ॥ तै. ब्रा. III. 5. 11. This is partly explained in तै. सं. II. 6. 10. This is called शंयुवाक. Vide पा. I. 4. 29 on which the first वार्तिक is 'अनुवाकादयः पुंसि' and पतञ्जलि cites 'अनुवाकः शंयुवाकः सूक्तवाकः' as examples.

1136. इमानि यानि पञ्चेन्द्रियाणि मनःषष्ठानि मे हृदि ब्रह्मणा संशितानि । यैरेव ससृजे घोरं तैरेव शान्तिरस्तु नः ॥ अथर्व. 19. 9. 5.

the gods for refuge to the composer of the hymn and 13 declares that 'whatever things were appeased (by śāntis) in this world—these the seven sages know. May they all be happiness for me; may happiness be mine and may freedom from fear be mine'. Verse 14 which is similar to Vāj. S. 36. 17 declares that 'the earth, mid-regions, heaven, waters, trees and plants, all gods-these have become appeased and auspicious by the śānti rites performed by the composer and that by those śāntis, by all śāntis I (we) appease (remove the evil effect of) what is here terrible, what is cruel (or inauspicious), what is evil; may all that be appeased, be beneficial and happy for us'.[1137] Atharva 19. 10 (verses 1–10) contains the word 'śam' 51 times and prays for welfare to several gods and 19. 11 is also a śānti containing the word 'śam' 18 times. The Vājasaneya-samhitā chapter 36 (verses 8–12) similarly contain the word 'śam' several times. One of these viz. (Vāj. S. 36. 12) occurs in many Vedic texts[1138] 'May the divine waters confer on us happiness, help and protection; may they flow towards us for our our happiness and welfare'.

In the Tai. S. the words 'śamayati' and 'śānti' are frequently used often in the same passage or context. For example, it is said "Rudra[1139] is the fierce (or harsh) one among gods...; He (the priest) does as it were a harsh thing when he recites (that passage containing the word) Rudra; 'in the path of Mitra' he says for the sake of appeasing". There is a similar passage in the Ait. Br. While prescribing the recital of a ṛk verse (Ṛg. II. 33. 1) in the Āgnimāruta-śastra the Ait. Br. changes the original words of the latter half of the verse in the Ṛgveda and also suggests another verse altogether for recital

---

1137. ताभिः शान्तिभिः सर्वशान्तिभिः शमयामोऽहं यदिह घोरं यदिह क्रूरं यदिह पापं तच्छान्तं तच्छिवं सर्वमेव शमस्तु नः ॥ अथर्व 19. 9. 14.

1138. शं नो देवीरभिष्टय आपो भवन्तु पीतये। शं योरभि स्रवन्तु नः ॥ वाज० सं. 36. 12, ऋ. X. 9. 4, अथर्व I. 6. 1, सामवेद 33. तै. ब्रा. I. 2. 1, 1.

1139. रुद्रस्त्वावर्तयत्वित्याह। रुद्रो वै क्रूरो देवानां...क्रूरमिव वा एतत्करोति यद्रुद्रस्य कीर्तयति मित्रस्य पथेत्याह शान्त्यै। तै. सं. VI. 1. 7. 7–8; The original ṛk is आ ते पितर्मरुतां सुम्नमेतु मा नः सूर्यस्य सन्दृशो युयोथाः। अभि नो वीरो अर्वति क्षमेत प्र जायेमहि रुद्र प्रजाभिः ॥ ऋ. II. 33. 1. The ऐ. ब्रा. reads 'त्वं नो वीरो अर्वति क्षमेथाः' for अभि नो वीरो अर्वति क्षमेथा प्र जायेमहि रुद्रिय प्रजाभिः ॥'. If one employed अभि नो, Rudra might have seized the progeny and the word रुद्रिय (meaning a servant of Rudra) avoids the use of the harsh name Rudra. 'प्रजायेमहि रुद्रिय प्रजाभिरिति भयाद्ध रुद्रेरयेतस्यैव नाम्नः परिहृत्यै। तद्धु खलु शं नः करतीत्येव शंसेच्छमिति प्रतिपद्यते सर्वस्मा एव शान्त्यै। ...सोऽनिरुक्ता रौद्री शान्ता सर्वायुः सर्वायुत्वाय। ऐ. ब्रा. 13. 10.

(I. 43. 6 'śam naḥ karatyarvate sugam meṣāya meṣye nṛbhyo nāribhyo gave') because in the first place that verse begins with the auspicious word 'śam' and in the second place because that verse, though the *devatā* (deity) thereof is Rudra, does not expressly mention that word; the result, says the Ait. Br., is that that verse being one of appeasement (śānti) the priest secures long life and procures long life for the sacrificer.

Another example of 'śamayati in the Tai. S. is as follows: When an *agnihotrin* is going on a journey with his household he should offer *homa* to Vāstoṣpati, but if he goes without offering a homa to Vāstoṣpati evil consequences follow; 'Rudra is indeed Vāstoṣpati; if he were to go out without offering homa to Vāstoṣpati, Agni would become Rudra, would leap after him and kill him; (but) when he offers to Vāstoṣpati, he appeases him (Rudra-Agni) with his own share and the sacrificer meets no injury (or distress)'.[1140]

Another example of 'śāmayati' and 'śānti' in the Tai. S. (VI. 3. 3. 2-3) may be set out. 'O tree! protect it; O axe! do not harm it; the axe indeed is a thunderbolt; (therefore he utters those words) for allaying (the fierce power of the axe); these worlds are afraid of the tree (of which the yūpa is made) when it moves; (therefore he recites 'with thy top do not graze the sky, with thy middle do not harm the atmospheric region'. (By these words) he appeases (removes the terrible power for evil of) this tree'.[1141]

The foregoing passages are quite sufficient for showing the significance attached to the words 'śam', 'śamayati' and 'śānti' in the Vedic saṁhitās. The word 'śantama' occurs in the Ṛgveda about two dozen times. It is applied to the great gods like Agni, Indra, Soma (I. 16. 7, I. 77. 2, IX. 104. 3), to the praises of gods (I. 76. 1, VI. 32. 1), to the worshipper or singer (VIII. 13. 22), to protection by gods (V. 76. 3, X. 15. 4) and generally means 'beneficent or conferring happiness'. Simi-

---

1140. रुद्रः खलु वै वास्तोष्पतिर्यदहुत्वा वास्तोष्पतीयं प्रयायाद् रुद्र एनं भूत्वाऽग्निरनूत्थाय हन्याद्वास्तोष्पतीयं जुहोति भागधेयेनैवैनं शमयति नार्तिमार्च्छति यजमानः । तै. सं. III. 4. 10. 3. Compare बौ. श्रौ. 14. 19.

1141. ओषधे त्रायस्वैनं स्वधिते मैनं हिंसीरित्याह वज्रो वै स्वधितिः शान्त्यै ।...इमे वै लोका यूपात्प्रयतो बिभ्यति दिवमग्रेण मा लेखीरन्तरिक्षं मध्येन मा हिंसीरित्याहैभ्य एवैनं लोकेभ्यः शमयति । तै. सं. VI. 3. 3. 2-3; compare **वाज. सं. 5. 42-43 and शतपथ III. 6. 4. 13 for similar words.**

larly, the word 'śantāti' (Ṛg. I. 112. 20, VIII. 18. 7) means 'beneficent'.

The causal (śamayati) of the verb 'śam' and the word 'śānti' do not occur in the Ṛgveda, but they are as said above frequently employed in the Tāittirīya and other Saṁhitās and in the Brāhmaṇas. Some further examples may be set out here. The Tai. S. relates the following legend "Agni was in the yonder world (heaven), the sun was in this world; these worlds were (then) unappeased (disturbed). The gods said 'come, let us change (transpose) these two'. They placed Agni in this world with the words 'O Agni, come here for the dainty meal' and (placed) the Sun in the yonder world with the worlds 'the great and powerful one, O Agni'; then indeed these two worlds became free from disturbance. Since he repeated those words in this way, it served for the purpose of quieting these worlds (that were once disturbed). These worlds became undisturbed (auspicious) for him who knows this".[1142] Here we have both the verbal form 'aśāmyatāma' (from 'śam' 4th conj.) and the the word 'śāntyai'.

In some passages of the Ṛgveda the word 'śami' occurs (as in I. 87. 5, II. 31. 6, III. 55. 3, VIII. 45. 27, X. 40. 1.). It is generally interpreted by Sāyaṇa in these passages as the locative singular of 'śamī', which is explained to mean 'karman' (action, sacrifice or the like). Two of these may be cited here [1143] "my desires fly in many directions; I shall brighten ancient (lauds) towards 'śamī' (for employing them in various sacrifices?); knowing the truth in Turvaṣa (king) and Yadu (king) he (Indra) enveloped Ahnavāyya (their enemy) in warlike action." It is possible to take 'śami' as the locative singular of 'śam' treated as a noun. The word 'śamī' occurs in many passages of the Ṛgveda (I. 20. 2, I. 83. 4, I. 110. 4, II. 1. 9, III. 60. 3, IV. 3. 4, IV. 17. 18, IV. 22. 8, IV. 33. 4, V. 77. 4, V. 42. 10, VI. 3. 2, VI. 52. 1, VIII. 75. 14, IX. 74. 7, X. 28. 12). In all these passages

---

1142. इमौ लोकावशान्तावास्तां ते देवा अब्रुवन्नेतेमौ विपर्यूहामेत्यग्न आ याहि वीतय इत्यस्मिँल्लोकेऽग्निमदधुर्बृहदग्ने सुवीर्यमित्यमुष्मिँल्लोके आदित्यम्। ततो वा इमौ लोकावशाम्यतां यदेवमन्वाहानयोर्लोकयोः शान्त्यै। शाम्यतोऽस्मा इमौ लोकौ य एवं वेद॥ तै. सं. II. 5. 8. 2. अशान्त here means 'the evil, aspects or influences in which had not been removed or conjured away.

1143. वि मे पुरुत्रा पतयन्ति कामाः शम्यच्छा दीद्ये पूर्व्याणि। ऋ. III. 55. 3; सत्यं तत्तुर्वशे यदौ विदानो अह्नवाय्यम्। व्यानट् तुर्वणे शमि॥ ऋ. VIII. 45. 27. In the last verse Sāyaṇa takes शमि as objetcive singular of शमी (instead of loc singular as he does elsewhere).

Sāyaṇa interprets it as 'karma' and not as the 'śamī tree or branch'. But in one place at least (if not in more places) the word śamī can easily be held to mean 'the śamī wood or fuel-stick'.[1144] 'To that mortal who worships with sacrifices and appeases with 'śamīs' (śamī fuel-sticks) and gives offerings to Agni that abounds in wealth disappointment as to glory never comes nor does sin nor arrogance overtake him.'

The whole of chapter 36 of the Vājasaneya-saṁhitā is employed as śānti at the beginning and end of the Pravargya rite, according to Kāt. Śr. S. 26. 41 'śāntikaraṇam-ādyantayoḥ'; verses 9–12 of Vāj. S. 36 employ the word 'śam' 17 times and verse 9 is the same as Ṛgveda I. 90. 9.

An interesting text in connection with the root 'śam' is the *adhrigu praiṣa*, to be recited by the Hotṛ priest before the *paśu* is killed in a sacrifice. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1121 note 2504 for the formula which is rather long. The important[1145] words for the present purpose are at the beginning and at the end 'O divine slayers and human slayers! begin (the process of killing the paśu). ...O Adhrigu! you should slay (the *paśu*) in such a way that it would be properly carried out'. Here the root (śam) certainly means to slay; this meaning is, however, apparently quite different from the one so far considered (viz. to appease, to remove evil effects). But it may be that there is a secondary meaning, viz. appease the gods by offering parts of the animal killed in the sacrifice.

The Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa closely connects the śamī tree or branch with the conjuring away or appeasing the terrible or angry aspects of deities in the following myth:[1146] "Prajāpati

---

1144. ईजे यज्ञेभिः शशमे शमीभिर्ऋधद्वारायाग्नये ददाश। एवा चन तं यशसामजुष्टिर्नांहो मर्तं नशते न प्रदृप्तिः॥ ऋ. VI. 3. 2; compare ऋ. VI. 1. 9 सो अग्न ईजे शशमे च मर्तो यस्त आनट् समिधा हव्यदातिम्।.

1145. दैव्याः शमितार आरभध्वमुत मनुष्याः।...अध्रिगो शमीध्वं सुशमि शमीध्वं शमीध्वमध्रिगा३उ अपाप। आश्व. श्रौ. III. 3. The passage occurs in तै. ब्रा. III. 6. 6. 4, ऐ. ब्रा. VI (अध्याय), 6–7 (खण्ड). The words सुशमि शमीष्वं occur in तै. सं. I. 1 5. 2, वाज. सं. I. 15. The words अध्रिगो &c. quoted here occur in कौशिकसूत्र 69. 6.

1146. प्रजापतिरग्निमसृजत। सोऽबिभेत्प्र मा धक्ष्यतीति। तं शम्याऽशमयत्। तच्छम्यै शमित्वम्। यच्छमीमयः सम्भारो भवति शान्त्या अप्रदाहाय। तै. ब्रा. I. 1. 3. 11. सायण explains 'शमयत्यनेनेति व्युत्पत्त्या शमीति नाम सम्पन्नम्। अतस्तत्संभारः पूर्वं विद्यमानस्य दाहस्योपशान्त्यै, इतः परमदाहाय च सम्पद्यते.'

created Agni; he (Prajāpati) became afraid 'this Agni might burn me'. He (Prajāpati) pacified (the terrible flame or glow of) Agni with śamī (branch); that is the beneficent or happy aspect of śamī in that the equipment required for Agni is full of śamī in order to appease Agni and for freedom from being burnt thereafter.' The idea is that Agni, the moment it was created had a fierce and evil aspect, that was removed by the use of the śamī and śānti means an action or rite that appeases the evil aspects of a deity and makes the deity beneficent. Similarly, the Aitareya-brāhmaṇa says:[1147] "He recites the verse 'they worship you with offerings whatever abodes you may have;...he says: O Soma! move towards houses in such a way as not to kill the sons (of the sacrificer).' Houses are indeed called 'duryā' and the house of the sacrificer is afraid of the king Soma when he approaches the sacrificer's house; when he (the priest) repeats this (verse) he thereby appeases him (king Soma) by a śānti (propitiatory rite); he (Soma) becoming beneficent (by the respetition of the mantra) does not kill the progeny or the cattle (of the sacrificer)." The idea is that king Soma might be angry with the sacrificer if there be any defect in the sacrificial rite and that when the hotṛ priest repeats the verse 'avīrahā o–' that verse is the cause of appeasement.

In the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa there is a similar reference to the appeasing power of the śamī branch. "He (the priest) places fuel sticks on this (Agni). ... He places (on Agni) a fuel stick of śamī as the first. This (Agni) was kindled when this oblation (of śamī branch) was offered and flamed upwards. The gods became afraid of him (Agni) lest Agni might harm them. They (gods) saw this śamī branch and appeased him (Agni) with that; inasmuch as they appeased this (Agni) by means of śamī (branch) this is called śamī. In the same way this sacrificer appeases with śamī this (Agni) for procuring appeasement and not for food"[1148]. It would be noticed

---

1147. या ते धामानि हविषा यजन्तीत्यन्वाह। '''अवीरहा प्र चरा सोम दुर्यानिति। गृहा वै दुर्या बिभ्यति वै सोमाद्राज्ञ आयतो यजमानस्य गृहाः। स यदेतामन्वाह शान्त्यैवैनं तच्छमयति सोऽस्य शान्तो न प्रजां न पशून् हिनस्ति। ऐ. ब्रा. 3. 2. The verse 'या ते'''दुर्यान्' is ऋ. I. 91. 19.

1148. अथास्मिन्समिध आदधाति। स वै शमीमयीं प्रथमादधाति। एतद्वा एष एतस्यामाहुत्यां हुतायां प्रादीप्यतोदज्वलत्। तस्माद्देवा अबिभयुर्यद्वै नोऽयं न हिंस्यादिति। त एतां शमीमपश्यंस्तयैनमशमयंस्तद्यदेतं शम्या अशमयंस्तस्माच्छमी तथैवैनमयमेतच्छम्या शमयति शान्त्या एव न जग्ध्यै। शतपथ IX. 2. 3. 36 and 37.

that here the name 'śamī' is derived from the root 'śam' and it is the means of effecting śānti (appeasement).

In the Brāhmaṇas the means of appeasement are various but simple. Often times the recitation of a Vedic verse or hymn effects śānti. For example, the Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa[1149] prescribes the singing of sāmans at the time of consecrating the sacred śrauta fires; the three *sāmans* are Rathantara, Vāmadevya and Bṛhat, each being connected with the three worlds respectively. "When Agni is being taken out, he sings the Vāmadevya sāman; Vāmadevya is the atmospheric region and thereby (i. e. by singing Vāmadevya) he makes Agni established in the atmospheric region; Vāmadevya is śānti (means of bringing about the appeasement of Agni); (on singing Vāmadevya) he takes out Agni that has become appeased (beneficent) and as bestower of cattle". The Tai. S. says[1150] "he says 'weave ye with regular measure the work of the singers'. Whatever superfluity (or flaw) is committed in the sacrifice, this (recitation) serves to eradicate its evil effects". The Ait. Br. provides "(the priest) who is about to sprinkle holy water over him[1151] (the king) should (himself first recite the mantra and) make the king repeat it (after him) 'O Waters! look on me with a beneficent eye, (and) touch my skin with (your) beneficent body. I invoke all the Agnis that dwell in waters for your sake; this should be done for the purpose that waters (the evil aspects of which have been) not appeased may not destroy the vigour of him who is being sprinkled over". The Hotṛ performs a *japa* before and after reciting the *sāmidhenī* verses. About this the Śāṅkhāyana-brāhmaṇa says[1152] that the sāmidhenīs are a thun-

---

1149. वामदेव्यमभिगायत उद्ध्रियमाणे । अन्तरिक्षं वै वामदेव्यम् । अन्तरिक्ष एवैनं प्रतिष्ठित-माधत्ते । अथो शान्तिर्वै वामदेव्यम् । शान्तमेवैनं पशव्यमुद्धरते । तै. ब्रा. I. 1. 8. 2. The वामदेव्य is sung on the verse 'कया नश्चित्र आ भुवत्' ऋ. IV. 31. 1 which occurs also in तै. सं IV. 2. 11. 2, वाज. सं. 27. 39 and 36. 4, अथर्ववेद 20. 124. 1. The द्राह्यायणश्रौतसूत्र (XII. 1 29-31) provides 'जाते रथन्तरं गायेत्। वामदेव्यं ह्रियमाणे। बृहन्निहिते।'

1150. अनुल्बणं वयत जोगुवामप इत्याह । यद्वै यज्ञ उल्बणं क्रियते तस्यैवैषा शान्तिः । तै. सं. III. 4. 2. 6-7; 'अनुल्बणं वयत जोगुवामपः' is the 3rd quarter of ऋ. X. 53.6.

1151. अथैनमभिषेक्ष्यन्नपां शान्तिं वाचयति । शिवेन मा चक्षुषा पश्यतापः शिवया तन्वोप स्पृशत त्वचं मे । सर्वाँ अग्नीँरप्सुषदो हुवे वो मयि वर्चो बलमोजो निधत्तेति । नेत्स्याभि-षिषिचानस्याशान्ता आपो वीर्यं निर्हणन्निति । ऐ. ब्रा. 37. 2. The मन्त्र 'शिवेन मा' occurs in तै. सं. V. 6. 1. 2 and अथर्ववेद I. 33. 4 (only the first half).

1152. अथ यत्पुरस्तात्सामिधेनीनां जपति वज्रो वै सामिधेन्यस्तमेवैतच्छमयति पुरस्ता-च्चोपरिष्टाच्च । शाङ्खायनब्रा. 3. 3. Generally there are 15 **सामिधेनी verses, but there are optional numbers which need not be specified here.**

derbolt and that if *japa* is performed thereby he appeases (*śamayati*) Agni (i. e. Agni becomes auspicious and beneficent).

Water also is declared as a means of effecting the removal or appeasement of evil effects. The Ait. Br. remarks[1153] " they say what is the atonement (prāyaścitti) if a person's sacrificial material (milk or rice) when put on a fire for cooking spurts out or overflows ? (The reply is) ' he should make it go down with water for the sake of śānti; water indeed is (a means of) śānti and then he should touch the material (that has fallen out) with his right hand and recite a mantra (that is specified) or he should recite another ṛk verse ' by whose power the worlds are made fixed ', which is addressed to Viṣṇu and Varuṇa; Viṣṇu indeed is the saviour against what is badly sacrificed (i. e. the defects in it), while Varuṇa protects (i. e. prevents obstacles to securing the fruit of) what is well sacrificed; (this latter mantra is recited) for śānti in regard to both (defects as well as good points). This is the prāyaścitti in this case." It should be noticed that here śānti (rite) and prāyascitti are identified. The Śāṅkhāyana[1151] Br. also (III. 6) says "waters are (means of) śānti, (they are) an antidote and therefore after pronouncing the word 'vaṣaṭ' the priest touches water." In the Tai. Ār. (IV. 42) there are 37 mantras of śānti used in the Pravargya rite. Some of these occur in the Ṛgveda-saṁhitā e. g. the 8th (Vāta ā vātu bhesajam) is Ṛg. X. 186. 1, mantras 15–17 are equal to Ṛg. IV. 31. 1–3; mantras 22–24 are Ṛg. X. 9. 1–3. The same Āraṇyaka (IV. 26–35) and Baud. Śr. S. IX. 18 contain several mantras for śāntis, some of which are interesting and are set out here to show how the theory of śāntis was being expanded or enlarged. " If the[1155] sacrificial vessel called

---

1153. तदाहुर्यस्याग्निहोत्रमधिश्रितं स्कन्दति वा विष्यन्दते वा का तत्र प्रायश्चित्तिरिति तदद्भिरुपनिनयेच्छान्त्यै शान्तिर्वा आपोऽथैनद्दक्षिणेन पाणिनाभिमृश्य जपति। दिवं तृतीयं देवान् यज्ञोऽगात्ततो मा द्रविणमाष्ट, अन्तरिक्षं तृतीयं पितॄन्यज्ञो...ष्ट. पृथिवीं तृतीयं मनुष्यान् यज्ञो...ष्ट, इति। ययोरोजसा स्कभिता रजांसीति वैष्णुवारुणीमृचं जपति विष्णुर्वै यज्ञस्य दुरिष्टं पाति वरुणः स्विष्टं तयोरुभयोरेव शान्त्यै। सा तत्र प्रायश्चित्तिः॥ ऐ. ब्रा. 32. 4. The मन्त्र 'ययोरोजसा' occurs in वाज. सं. 8. 60 and अथर्व VII. 25. 1 (and in several other texts). Compare मैत्रा. सं. III. 9. 4 'यूपो वै यज्ञस्य दुरिष्टमामुञ्चते यदि यूपमुपस्पृशेद्यज्ञस्य दुरिष्टमा मुञ्चेत्। तस्माद्यूपो नोपस्पृश्यः।'.

1154. वषट्कृत्याप उपस्पृशति। शान्तिर्वै भेषजमापः शान्तिरेवैषा भेषजमन्ततो यज्ञे क्रियते। शां. ब्रा. 3. 6.

1155. अथ यदि घर्मदुघं वा महावीरं वा स्तेनोऽपहरेद्गार्हपत्ये स्रुवाहुतिं जुहुयादहोरात्रे त्वोदीरयतामिति। बौ. श्रौ. IX, 18; that मन्त्र is 'अहोरात्रे त्वोदीरयताम्। अर्धमासास्त्वोदीजयन्तु। मासास्त्वा श्रपयन्तु। ऋतवस्त्वा पचन्तु। संवत्सरस्त्वा हन्त्वसौ।' तै. आ. IV. 26. असौ refers to the name of the thief as in 'हे देवदत्त चोर त्वामहोरात्रे' &c.

mahāvīra (in Pravargya rite) of the hot milk for the Gharma offering were to be stolen by a thief, one should offer in the Gārhapatya fire an oblation of ghee with the *sruva* ladle to the accompaniment of the mantra 'May Day and Night disclose thee as thief". 'If a wild[1156] forest dog were to bark (while the Pravargya rite is on), the priest should repeat by way of a magic formula the text 'vi gā Indra vicaran spāśayasva' (O Indra, observe the cows while you move about'), should cast a kindled firebrand on both sides with the words 'O Agni, converse with Agni, and then he worships Agni with the words 'O Agni, salutation to thee once, twice, thrice &c.' If a vulture screeches he recites the formula 'you are undistinguishable (from other birds) since you have blood in your beak', if an owl or she-owl hoots he recites the mantra 'In this way the owl approaches &c.'. Therefore it may be said that śānti is used in the early Vedic texts in several senses viz. (1) the state of being freed from evil aspects or effects, (2) means of appeasing or removing evil aspects, such as water, a Vedic verse or hymn, (3) rite for appeasement.

Apart from the simple śāntis for appeasing deities in sacrificial matters, even the Ṛgveda contains indications that there were other occurrences which were thought to be unlucky and against the supposed evil effects of which some remedies were employed. For example, Ṛg. X. 164 (1–5) is a hymn declared by the Anukramaṇī and Ṛgvidhāna IV. 20. 1 as counteracting the indications of bad dreams.[1157] Verse 3 of it is 'May Agni place far away from us all evil and undesirable actions which we may have done while awake or asleep whether by our desires or imprecations or want of desire'. In Ṛg. V. 82. 4–5[1158] the

1156. यद्येकवृको वाश्येत तमनुमन्त्रयते वि गा इन्द्र विचरन् स्पाशयस्वेत्यथास्मा उभयत आदीप्तमुल्मुकं क्षिपेदग्ने अग्निना संवदस्वेत्यथैनमुपतिष्ठते नमस्ते अग्ने नमो द्विस्ते नमस्त्रिस्ते नम इति। यदि गृध्रो वाश्येत तमनुमन्त्रयते असृङ्मुखो रुधिरेणाव्यक्त इति। ...यद्युलूकोलूकी वाश्येत तमनुमन्त्रयत इत्थादुलूक आ पतादिति। बौ. श्रौ. IX. 18. The texts mentioned in this passage are तै. आ. IV. 28, 29, 33. Both the तै. आ. and बौ. श्रौ. refer to other phenomena which are not set out here.

1157. यदाशसा निःशसाभिशसोपारिम जाग्रतो यत्स्वपन्तः। अग्निर्विश्वान्यप दुष्कृतान्यजुष्टान्यारे अस्मद् दधातु॥ ऋ. X. 164. 3 ऋग्विधान IV. 1 is अपेहीति जपेत्सूक्तं शुचिर्दुःस्वप्ननाशनम्।.

1158. अद्या नो देव सवितः प्रजावत् सावीः सौभगम्। परा दुःष्वप्न्यं सुव। विश्वानि देव सवितर्दुरितानि परा सुव। यद्भद्रं तन्न आ सुव॥ ऋ. V. 82. 4–5; यो मे राजन् युज्यो वा सखा वा स्वप्ने भयं भीरवे मह्यमाह। स्तेनो वा यो दिप्सति नो वृको वा त्वं तस्माद्वरुण पाह्यस्मान्॥ ऋ. II. 28. 10; त्रिते दुःष्वप्न्यं सर्वमाप्त्ये परि दद्मस्यनेहसो व ऊतयः सुऊतयो व ऊतयः॥ ऋ. VIII. 47. 15.

poet prays 'O God Savitṛ! today produce for us welfare endowed with progeny and frighten away the effects of bad dreams; O God Savitṛ! drive away all sins (or evils) and confer on us what is beneficent' (or auspicious). In Ṛg. II. 28. 10 the poet prays 'O king Varuṇa! whoever, whether a helper or a friend, declares to me who ascertained a danger (from what I saw) in a dream or whoever, a thief or a wolf, intends to harm me, from that guard us'. In Ṛg. VIII. 47. 15 the sage exclaims 'we deliver all our bad dreams to Trita Āptya; your kindness cannot be obstructed by any one, the protection given by you is good'. Vide also Ṛg. VIII. 47. 14, 16-18, X. 36. 4, X. 37, 4 for bad dreams. Similarly, the Ṛgveda contains verses which show that cries of birds were deemed to indicate coming good or evil and the hooting of the owl was thought to be unlucky. 'It [1159] (the bird) frequently cries and proclaims what is to come and it propels his speech as an oarsman propels a boat; O bird! May you be auspicious to us; may no overpowering (or unfavourable) phenomenon reach you from any side'. The three verses of Ṛg. II. 43 refer to the cries of birds. 'The birds, chirping, utter cries towards the south (of the house) like composers of songs that speak for food at various seasons; O bird! when you chirp, speak what would be to our welfare, when you are silent think of good thoughts about us; when flying up (from our house) you utter (cries) like a lute; may we be endowed with valiant sons and speak much in assemblies'. Ṛg. X. 165 contains several verses about a kapota bird and one about an owl. Ṛg. X. 165. 1 and 4 are: [1160] 'a kapota bird, messenger of ill-luck, has come to this our house, with whatever (evil) intent; we worship you, we shall perform atonement; O God! May it fare well with our men and quadrupeds. May what the owl expresses (by its

---

1159. कनिक्रदज्जनुषं···त्रिदत् ॥ ऋ. II. 42 1. q. in note 755 p. 526. निरुक्त IX. 4 explains this verse. सायण holds that the bird referred to is कपिञ्जल. निरुक्त IX. 5 quotes a verse from a खिलसूक्त addressed to कपिञ्जल 'भद्रं वद दक्षिणतो···भद्रं पश्चात्कपिञ्जल,' which occurs in कौशिकसूत्र 46. 54 प्रदक्षिणिदाभि गृणन्ति कारवो वयो वदन्त ऋतुथा शकुन्तयः। ···आवदंस्त्वं शकुने भद्रमावद तूष्णीमासीनः सुमतिं चिकिद्धि नः। यदुत्पतन्वदसि कर्करिर्यथा बृहद्वदेम विदथे सुवीराः॥ ऋ. II 43. 1 and 3. The last verse is quoted in कौशिकसूत्र 46. 54 among the कपिञ्जलस्वस्त्ययनs. Vide ऋग्विधान I. 31. 4 for a similar provision against sounds of birds.

1160. शिवः कपोत इषितो नो अस्त्वनागा देवाः शकुनो गृहेषु। ···यदुलूको वदति मोघमेतद्यत्कपोतः पदमग्नौ कृणोति। यस्य दूतः प्रहित एष एतत्तस्मै यमाय नमोस्तु मृत्यवे॥ ऋ. X. 165. 2 and 4; अथर्व VI. 27. 1-3 are almost the same as ऋ. X. 165. 1-3, अथर्व VI. 27.1 is ऋ. X. 165. 5 and अथर्व VI. 29. 1-2 are similar to ऋ. X. 165. 4. कपोतश्चेदगारमुपहन्यादनुपतेद्वा देवाः कपोत इति प्रत्यृचं जुहुयाज्जपेद्वा। आश्व. गृ. III. 7. 7; compare मानवगृ. II. 17 and कौशिकसूत्र 46. 7 and ऋग्विधान IV. 20.2.

hooting) turn out to be fruitless or (untrue). What the kapota bird (expresses) by placing its feet near our Agni (be untrue); here is salutation to Yama, the god of Death, whose messenger is this (bird) sent (by the god)'. The Āśvalāyana-gṛhya provides 'if a kapota (pigeon) strikes against a house (enters it) or flies along its length, the house-holder should offer into fire oblations (of ghee) with each verse of the hymn ('devāḥ kapota', Ṛg. X. 165) or he should recite it inaudibly'. The Kauṣitaki-gṛhya provides for the same (in V. 5. 1–2) and proceeds[1161] "if a man sees a bad dream or when the cawing of a crow is heard in the night and in the case of other *adbhutas* (untoward or unusual occurrences) he should cook rice grains in the milk of a cow that has a calf of the same colour (as itself) but in no case of a black cow and let him sacrifice with the hymn to Night (Ṛg. X. 127) verse by verse and having partaken of the remnants of the oblations with the *mahāvyāhṛtis* and having recited over his ears the verse 'bhadram karṇebhiḥ' (Ṛg. I. 89.8) and over himself the verse 'śatam-in-nu' (Ṛg. I. 89. 9) donate something to the brāhmaṇas". The Śāṅkhāyana-gṛhya (V. 6, 7, 10 and 11) provides: "if a disease befalls a person, he should offer boiled Gavedhuka grains with the hymn' these prayers to the powerful Rudra' &c. verse by verse (Ṛg. I. 114). If the honey bees make honey in a man's house, he should fast and sacrifice a hundred and eight pieces of udumbara wood besmeared with curds, honey and ghee with two verses Ṛg. I.114. 8–9 and murmur the hymn (Ṛg. VII. 35) and if an ant-hill arises in his house the house should be abandoned and having fasted three nights (and days) he should perform the 'Mahāśānti'.[1162]

1161. स्वप्नदर्शने निशायां। काकशब्दकाले च। अन्येषु चाद्भुतेषु च। पयसा चरुं श्रपयित्वा सरूपवत्साया गोः पयसि। न त्वेव कृष्णायाः। रात्रिसूक्तेन प्रत्यृचं जुहुयात्। हुतशेषं महाव्याहृतिभिः प्राश्य भद्रं कर्णेभिरिति कर्णौ शतमिन्नु शरदो अन्ति देवा इत्यात्मानमभिमन्त्र्य ब्राह्मणेभ्यः किञ्चिद्दद्यात्। कौषी. गृ. V. 5; compare मानवगृह्य II. 15 यदि दुःस्वप्नं पश्येद् व्याहृतिभिस्तिलान् हुत्वा दिश उपतिष्ठेत। (formulas for four quarters, lower regions, and upper regions are cited which occur in काठकसंहिता 37. 10.)

1162. महाशान्ति. The com of नारायण explains that महाशान्ति means विनायकशान्ति and नवग्रहशान्ति. It is doubtful whether these two were known to the author of the शाङ्खायनगृह्य; the कौशिकसूत्र (39.27, 43.5 and 44.6) prescribes a महाशान्ति which is different. कौशिक 43.5 is वास्तोष्पत्यादीनि महाशान्तिमावपते and कौशिक 8. 23 prescribes 'इहैव ध्रुवामिह यातु, यमो मृत्युः, सत्यं बृहदित्यनुवाको वास्तोष्पतीयानि.' These are अथर्व III. 12. 1 (इहैव ध्रुवाम्); VI, 73.1 (एह यातु), VI. 93.1 (यमो मृत्युः), XII. 1 (सत्यं बृहत्). This last अनुवाक has 63 verses. Among later medieval works the शान्तिमयूख (pp. 106–108) describes an elaborate महाशान्ति.

The Aitareya-Āraṇyaka mentions ten dreams viz. a person sees a dark man with black teeth and such a man kills him, or a boar kills him, or an ape jumps on him, the wind carries him swiftly; having swallowed gold, he vomits it; he eats honey; he chews stalks of lotuses; he carries a single (red) lotus; he drives with a team of asses or boars; himself wearing a wreath of *nalada* flowers,[1163] he drives towards the south a black cow having a black calf. If a man sees any one of these, he should fast, cook a dish of rice in milk in a vessel, offer into fire oblations thereof with each of the verses of the hymn to Night (Ṛg. X 127. 1-8), feed brāhmaṇas with other food (cooked in the house) and should himself eat boiled rice'.[1164] The same Āraṇyaka mentions in the same context some unusual phenomena such as the sun appearing like the moon (pale and without heat) or the sky becoming like madder and prescribes the recital of some Ṛgvedic verses (such as IX. 67. 21-27, VIII. 6. 30, IX. 113. 6-11, I. 50. 10).

The Chāndogya Up. contains a verse saying 'if a person engaged in rites for securing a certain desired object sees a woman in a dream, one should understand on seeing such a sight that he will prosper (i. e. secure that object).'[1164a] The Chāndogya Upaniṣad (VIII. 10. 1), the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (IV. 3. 7-20) and Praśna IV. 5 contain profound thoughts on the psychology of dream phenomena, but as that discussion

---

1163. In the Āśv. Śr. (quoted in H. of Dh. vol. IV p. 203 n. 481) it is provided that the corpse of an *āhitāgni* is to be decked with a wreath of *naladas*. The south is the direction of the *pitṛs*; vide Śatapatha Br. I. 2. 5. 17 (eṣā vai dik pitṛṇām'). Therefore, to see in a dream oneself wearing a wreath of naladas or driving towards the south was deemed to forebode death.

1164. अथ स्वप्नाः। पुरुषं कृष्णं कृष्णदन्तं पश्यति स एनं हन्ति वराह एनं हन्ति मर्कट एनमास्कन्दत्याशु वायुरेनं प्रवहति सुवर्णं खादित्वा प्रगिरति मध्वश्नाति बिसानि भक्षयत्येकपुण्डरीकं धारयति खरैर्वराहैर्युक्तैर्याति कृष्णां धेनुं कृष्णवत्सां नलदमाली दक्षिणामुखो व्राजयति। स यद्येतेषां किंचित्पश्येदुपोष्य पायसं स्थालीपाकं श्रपयित्वा रात्रीसूक्तेन प्रत्यृचं हुत्वाऽन्येनान्नेन ब्राह्मणान् भोजयित्वा चरुं स्वयं प्राश्नीयात्। ऐ. आ. III. 2. 4; vide मार्कण्डेयपुराण 40. 1-33 for signs of approaching death (Venk. ed.) of which verses 15-20, 27, 29, 31-33 deal with dreams. Some of these verses of मार्कण्डेय have a striking similarity to the ऐ. आ. passage; for example, मार्कण्डेय 40. 27 is : उष्ट्ररासभयानेन यः स्वप्ने दक्षिणां दिशम्। प्रयाति तं च जानीयात्सद्योमृत्युं नरेश्वर॥.

1164 a. यदा कर्मसु काम्येषु स्त्रियं स्वप्नेषु पश्यति। समृद्धिं तत्र जानीयात्तस्मिन् स्वप्ननिदर्शने॥ छान्दोग्य V. 2. 9 q. by शङ्कराचार्य on वेदान्तसूत्र II. 1. 6.

would not be relevant in the section on śānti nothing can be said here beyond quoting three striking passages.[1165]

The Atharvaveda also has several verses on dreams and on birds like *kapota* (pigeon). The Kauśikasūtra prescribes several verses of the Atharvaveda as śāntis in the case of dreams : 'on seeing a dream a man washes his face with the verses (Atharva VI. 45. 1 and 46. 1); if he sees a very terrible dream he offers into fire a cake of mixed grains[1166] or in another direction (in his enemy's field); he changes the side on which he sleeps with Atharva VII. 100. 1 : on seeing himself eating in a dream he recites the mantra (Atharva VII. 101. 1) and he looks on; with the verse 'vidma te' (Atharva VI. 46. 2) all (dreams) vanish.' Two of these verses may be set out here : 'O dream ! we know the place of thy birth : thou art the son of gods' sisters ; thou art the helper of Yama ; thou art the destroyer ; thou art death ; O dream ! we know thee to be so ; O dream ! do thou save us from evil dreams' ; 'I turn round (and lie on my other side) from evil dreaming, from bad dreaming, from ill-luck ; I make *brahman* (vedic prayer) my defence ; I put away the sorrows that come through dreams'.[1167] The Kātyāyana-śrauta-sūtra prescribes a similar verse for japa when a *dīkṣita* sees a disagreeable dream.[1168]

1165. य एष स्वप्ने महीयमानश्चरत्येष आत्मेति होवाचैतदमृतमभयं ब्रह्मेति स ह शान्तहृदयः प्रवव्राज... । छा. उप. VIII. 10. 1; अत्रैष देवः स्वप्ने महिमानमनुभवति यद्दृष्टं दृष्टमनुपश्यति श्रुतं श्रुतमेवार्थमनुशृणोति देशदिगन्तरैश्च प्रत्यनुभूतं पुनःपुनः प्रत्यनुभवति दृष्टं चादृष्टं च श्रुतं चाश्रुतं चानुभूतं चाननुभूतं च सच्चासच्च सर्वं पश्यति सर्वः पश्यति । प्रश्न IV. 5; कतम आत्मेति योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु हृद्यन्तर्ज्योतिः पुरुषः स समानः सन्नुभौ लोकावनुसञ्चरति ध्यायतीव लेलायतीव स हि स्वप्नो भूत्वेमं लोकमतिक्रामति मृत्यो रूपाणि । ...स यत्र प्रस्वपित्यस्य लोकस्य सर्वावतो मात्रामपादाय स्वयं विहत्य स्वयं निर्माय स्वेन भासा स्वेन ज्योतिषा प्रस्वपित्यत्रायं पुरुषः स्वयं ज्योतिर्भवति । बृह. उप. IV. 3. 7 and 9. Some of these passages on dreams are relied upon and discussed by Śaṅkarācārya on Vedāntasūtra I. 3. 42, II. 1. 28, III. 2. 1-4.

1166. The कौशिक 3. 20 enumerates मिश्रधान्यानि as 'व्रीहियवगोधूमोपवाकतिलप्रियङ्गुश्यामाका इति मिश्रधान्यानि'. The com. explains 'उपवाक इति अभियवाः । कुराष्ट्राणां प्रसिद्धाः ।'. श्यामाकs are called सांवे in Marāṭhi and उपवाक is इन्द्रजव (in Marāṭhi).

1167. विद्म ते स्वप्न जनित्रं देवजामीनां पुत्रोऽसि यमस्य करणः । अन्तकोऽसि मृत्युरसि तं त्वा स्वप्न तथा सं विद्म स नः स्वप्न दुःष्वप्न्यात् पाहि ॥ अथर्व VI. 46. 2 and XVI. 5. 6; पर्यावर्ते दुःष्वप्न्यात्पापात्स्वप्न्यादभूत्याः । ब्रह्माहमन्तरं कृण्वे परा स्वप्नमुखाः शुचः ॥ अथर्व VII. 100. 1.

1168. दीक्षितोऽमनोज्ञं स्वप्नं दृष्ट्वा जपेत्-पर्यावर्ते दुःस्वप्न्यात्पापात् स्वप्नादभूत्यै । ब्रह्माहमन्तरं करवे परः स्वप्नमुखा कृधीति । कात्या. श्रौ. सू. 25. 11. 20. The verse as printed is somewhat corrupt.

The Āpastamba-gṛhya (8. 23. 9) lumps together several unusual appearances and provides the same śānti in the case of all, 'If the post of a man's house puts forth shoots, or if honey is made in his house by bees or if the footprint of a pigeon is seen on the hearth or if disease arises in his family, or in the case of other miracles and prodigies, let him perform on the newmoon night, at dead of night, at a place where he does not hear the sound of water, the rites from the putting of wood on the fire to the *Ājyabhāga* oblations indicated in the next (Āpastambīyamantrapāṭha II. 22. 14-23), and then perform Jaya and following oblations.' Very similar provisions are found in Jaiminīya-gṛhya II. 7.[1169] The Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa contains several prāyaścittas (really śāntis) on the happening of numerous incidents. A few examples are set out here; when bad dreams[1170] are seen, the person should make repetition of Ṛg. V. 82. 4 twice (i. e. in all at least six times); in the case of any other prognosticatory occurrence not known from any work the person should repeat twice the verse Ṛg. IV. 31. 1. On seeing one's enemies with weapons raised to strike, the person

---

1169. स्थूणाविरोहणं मधुन उपवेशनं कुल्वां कपोतपददर्शनेऽमात्यानां शरीरेषणेऽन्येषु चाद्भुतोत्पातेष्वमावास्यां निशायां यत्रापां न शृणुयात्तदग्नेरुपसमाधानाद्याज्यभागान्त उत्तरा आहुतीर्हुत्वा जयादि प्रतिपद्यते। आप. गृ. 8. 23. 9 अथातोऽद्भुतशान्तिं व्याख्यास्यामः। अथ यद्यगारे स्थूणा विरोहेत्। कपोतो वागारं गच्छेद्गौर्वा गां धयेदनड्वान्वा दिवमुल्लिखेत्। अनग्नौ वा धूमो जायेतानग्नौ वा दीप्येत। मधु वा जायेत। वल्मीकं वोपजायेत मण्डूके वाऽम्भृणे वाश्येत् श्वानो गृहे पर्यटेयुरित्येतानन्यांश्च। यत्त इन्द्र भयामहे। सदस्पतिमद्भुतम्। अधायासुते सुसुदस्य (?)। सनादग्ने। यद्वा उ विश्पतिः शितः। प्रत्यग्ने। यं रक्षन्ति। प्राजापत्ययर्चा पुरस्ताच्चोपरिष्टाच्च महाव्याहृतिभिर्जुहोति। एतानि ऋक्सामानि गायेत्। जैमिनीयगृह्य II. 7 (Punjab S. Series). Pratikas (except the third अधा…स्य which is corrupt) are: ऋ. VIII. 61. 13, I. 18. 6, X. 87. 19, VIII. 23. 13, X. 87. 24, I. 41. 1, X. 121. 10 (प्रजापते न त्वदेतान्यन्यो). All these (except X. 87. 24 and X. 121. 10) occur in the सामवेद and some also in other संहिताs. बौ. गृ. III. 6 is very similar to जै. गृह्य.

1170. दुःस्वप्नेष्वद्य नो देव सवितरिति द्वितीयम्। अन्यस्मिंस्त्वनाज्ञाते कयानीयाद्वितीयमावर्तयेत्। सामवि. ब्रा. I. 8. 7-8. अद्य नो० is ऋ. V. 82. 4, सामवेद No. 141 (ed. by Satavalekar); कयानीया is कया नश्चित्र० (Ṛg. IV. 31. 1, Sāma No. 169). The com. notes that the lowest number of the repetition (आवृत्ति) of a mantra is three; the repetition may be recited several times more according to the gravity or otherwise of the 'adbhuta' and one's ability. आवृत्तिर्विशिष्यते ह्यपवरामिति। त्रिरावृत्तिर्जघन्या तत्तद्दोषगौरवलाघवानुगुण्येन ततोऽधिकं यथाशक्त्या वर्तयेत्। इत्यर्थः। उद्यतशस्त्रान्छत्रून्दृष्ट्वा देवव्रतानि मनसा ध्यायेन्नैनं हिंसन्ति। II. 44; देवव्रत is सामवेद I. 350 'एतो न्विन्द्रं स्तवाम शुद्धं शुद्धेन साम्ना। शुद्धैरुक्थैर्वावृध्वांसं शुद्धैराशीर्वान् ममत्तु॥'. It is also ऋ. VIII. 95. 7. It is one of the sacred texts by murmurring which or by homas with which a person is purified. Vide Vasiṣṭha-dharmasūtra 28. 10-15; देवव्रत is in verse 28. 13 of वसिष्ठ.

should revolve in his mind the Devavrata verse, then (the enemies) would not kill him. If one's house were to be burnt[1171] (accidentally) one should offer oblations anointed with ghee with the mantra 'born with the highest Dharman' (Sāmaveda no 90) and with words 'svāhā to Agni'. In II. 2. 2 The Sāmavidhāna Br. prescribes a śānti for one seized or posessed by an evil spirit. A portion of Ṣaḍvimśabrāhmaṇa (viz. V. 1–10) is styled Adbhuta-brāhmaṇa and contains śāntis for several kinds of utpātas. Some parts of it (such as V. 2–3) correspond with Āśvalāyana-gṛhya-pariśiṣṭa, 4. 11–15. The Ṣaḍvimśa-brāhmaṇa V. 7. 2. provides for earthquakes and cracks in palaces, which are similar to Yoga-yātrā 3. 13. The Atharvaveda 19. 9. 9 refers to showers of falling stars (nakṣatramulkābhihatam śam-astu naḥ) and Ṣaḍ-vimśa V. 9. 2. refers to falling meteors and V. 10. 2. to images laughing, weeping &c.

Reasons of space forbid further description of śāntis from the gṛhya-sūtras.

The preceding discussion with regard to śāntis is enough to show that śāntis were prescribed in the Vedic literature, the śrautasūtras, Sāmavidhāna-brāhmaṇa and Ṛgvidhāna, not only for appeasing the angry divinities or powers of evil, but also for occurrences like bad dreams or of portentous phenomena like the sun's or moon's appearance, the cries of unlucky birds &c.

This subject about śāntis against all sorts of omens and portents was very much elaborated in the post-Vedic literature. An extensive literature on śāntis exists in the Gṛhyasūtras, the Kauśika-sūtra, the Atharvaveda Pariśiṣṭas (particularly Nos. V, XXXI on Koṭihoma, XXXIII on Ghṛtakambala, XXXVII on 'samuccayaprāyaścittam', resembling 13th chapter of Kauśika, LVIII to LXVII on utpātas, adbhutaśāntis and dreams, LXXI and LXXII, the Purāṇas (like Matsya 92–93 and 228–238, Viṣṇu-dharmottara I. 90–105, II. 124–127, II. 159–164. Mārkaṇḍeya chap. 40, Agni 149, 164, 167, 259–268, 290–91, 320–324, Bhaviṣya IV. 141–145, Brahmāṇḍa III. 38. 30–34, the Bṛhatsaṁhitā chap. 45, the Śāntika-pauṣṭika-kāṇḍa of the Kṛtyakalpataru (Ms. in Baroda Oriental Institute), the Adbhutasāgara of Ballālasena and his son Lakṣmaṇasena (commenced to be written in śaka 1089 i. e. 1167 A.D.), the Śānti section of the Madanaratna (ms. in the Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner), Jyotistattva of Raghunandana

---

1171. अग्निदग्धे घृताक्तान्यवाञ्जुहुयाज्जातः परेण धर्मणेत्येतेनाग्नये स्वाहेति च । I. 8. 9.

(pp. 704 ff), the Śāntikamalākara of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa (ms. in Bhau Daji collection of the Bombay Asiatic Society), Śāntimayūkha of Nīlakaṇṭha. Of these the Adbhutasāgara is a very extensive work of 751 pages, edited by Pandit Murlidhar Jha and published by Prabhakari &c, Banares, in 1905 A. D. The Kṛtyakalpataru on Śāntis has not yet been edited and published in the Gaikwad Oriental Series. As compared with some other *kāṇḍas*, the section on śānti is meagre. It deals only with the following; Kūrmavibhāga (the distribution of the countries in Bhārata in 9 groups); Graha-makha or Grahayāga quoting Yāj. I. 295–308, Matsya, Narasiṁha and Bhaviṣya and Devīpurāṇa; Ayutahoma, Koṭihoma; Puṣyasnāna; Grahaśānti; Mātṛśānti; Liṅgaśānti; Vināyakaśānti (quoting Yāj. I. 271–294 and Matsya); Grahaṇasnāna; Saṅkrāntisnāna; mṛtavatsābhiṣeka; śāntis for variouas utpātas; Gāyatrīhoma; Rudrajapavidhi; ābhicārikakarma (magic rites). It is neither possible nor necessary to deal with this vast mass on śānti in this work in detail. Many of the śāntis described therein and in older śrauta and other works have been almost obsolete for a long time. Therefore, only a few śāntis now in vogue or very interesting from several viewpoints will be dealt with in this section.[1172]

The Kauśikasūtra (chapter 13, kaṇḍikās 93–136) is concerned with *adbhutas*, their descriptions and the śāntis therefor. Kaṇḍikā 93 brings together 42 portentous phenomena and the kaṇḍikās that follow deal with the description of the omen or portent and śāntis for each of these. In these śāntis, Atharvaveda mantras play a secondary role and the majority of the

1172. A recently published work by D. J. Hoens (pp. 1–197, S. Gravenhage, 1951) on 'Śānti' deals at some length only with śāntis in the Saṁhitās, Brāhmaṇas and Śrautasūtras. According to Keśava's Paddhati on Kauśika-sūtra (I 8; Bloomfield's ed. p. 307) and Sāyaṇa in his Intro. to Atharvaveda there were five Kalpas of the Atharvaveda mentioned by (an ancient commentator) Upavarṣa in his commentary on Jaimini I. 3. 11–14 called Kalpasūtrādhikaraṇa viz. नक्षत्रकल्प, वितानकल्प, संहिताकल्प, आङ्गिरसकल्प and शान्तिकल्प. सायण says (Muradabad edition of saṁvat 1986) 'शान्तिकल्पेपि प्रथमं वैनायकग्रहगृहीतलक्षणानि तच्छान्तये सम्भाराहरणम्, अभिषेकवैनायकहोमाः, तत्पूजाविधानम्, आदित्यादिनवग्रहयज्ञादिकमिति। (p 81, and p. 28 of Pandit's ed.), अथर्वपरिशिष्ट XLIX (चरणव्यूह p. 337, 4. 7). Vide JAOS vol. XI. p. 376–378 for the Kalpas of the Atharvaveda. The ब्रह्माण्डपुराण II. 35. 61-62 states 'नक्षत्रकल्पो वैतानस्तृतीयो संहिताविधिः। चतुर्थोऽङ्गिरसः कल्पः शान्तिकल्पश्च पञ्चमः। श्रेष्ठास्त्वथर्वणामेते संहितानां विकल्पकाः॥'. *The same verses occur in* वायुपुराण *61. 54*; compare also विष्णुपु० III. 6. 13-1।

mantras form an independent mantra material. It should be noted that at the end all these śāntis are spoken of as 'prāyaścitta'.

The subjects treated of in the Madanaratna (about 1425 to 1450 A. D.) on Śāntika-pauṣṭika would indicate how extensive was the cult of śāntis recommended in medieval times. The Anukramaṇikā at the beginning of the Ms. mentions the following: Vināyakasnāna; śāntis to placate the nine planets from the Sun to Ketu: Śanaiścaravrata; śāntis to placate Saturn extracted from Skanda (Nāgarakhaṇḍa and Prabhāsakhaṇḍa); worship of Jupiter and Venus; Śāntis based on the Yāmalas[1172a] on the conjunction of five or more planets; Grahasnānas from Viṣṇudharmottara; śāntis of the tithi and weekday when fever and other diseases seize a man; Nakṣatraśānti; śāntis for the nine nakṣatras called Janma and the rest (vide note 772 for these nine nakṣatras); śāntis for birth on Amāvāsyā, or on Mūla, Āśleṣā or Jyeṣṭhā nakṣatra; śānti for birth on the same nakṣatra as that of the father or (elder) brother; śāntis for birth on Gaṇḍa, Vaidhṛti, Vyatīpātayoga, Saṅkrānti, Viṣanāḍī, ecplipses; śānti called Gomukhaprasava; śāntis declared for the protection of the foetus from the first and following months from conception; *bali* offerings; medicine for removing pains of the foetus; measures for easy delivery; for protection of the child after birth; bali on first day with mantras &c.; nīrājana &c., description of sprinkling the infant with holy water, satiating gods and pitṛs with water, homas, *yantras* (mystical diagrams);

1172a. The *Yāmalas* are works of Tantra class, the numbers of which are variously given. But they are often said to be eight. Vide note 1598 below on *tantras*. The Rudrayāmala tantra was published by Jivananda containing over 6000 verses in 66 chapters in 1892. There are works called Gaṇeśayāmala, Brahmayāmala, Rudra-yamala, Viṣṇuyāmala, Śakti-yāmala, and several others. Certain *ghaṭīs* (or nāḍīs) of certain tithis, weekdays and nakṣatras are said by the Smṛti-kaustubha to be *viṣanāḍīs or viṣaghaṭīs* (producing very disastrous results), but in astrological works certain ghaṭīs of nakṣatras only have that appellation and a person born on those ghaṭīs forebodes the death and loss of the father, the mother, wealth and himself by poisoning, arms and missiles (according to Dharmasindhu p. 184). The Madanaratna on Śāntika (folios 15b to 20b) sets out numerous details about all the 27 nakṣatras from the work of Ātreya, one (detail) being the viṣaghaṭī of each nakṣatra e. g. as to Aśvinī three nāḍikās after 50th ghaṭikā constitute viṣanāḍī, as to Bharaṇī one ghaṭī after 24, as to Punarvasu and Puṣya one ghaṭī after 30 and 29 ghaṭīs respectively and so on.

general rules about the rites on the 1st to the 12th day after birth and in the first and following months of the first year after birth; applying ointments, fumigation, baths with mantras when a child is seized (or possessed) by an evil spirit; *homa* with *dūrvās* and homa for long life; śānti for *adbhutas* and śāntis for strange occurrences about images, Agni, trees, rainfall, reservoirs of water, for strange births, for birth of twins, for strange happenings about implements, beasts, collapse of temples and houses; śāntis for various *utpātas* and *adbhutas;* śāntis about kapota bird and on seeing the *coitus* of crows; śāntis relating to fall on one's body of the house lizard and chameleon; śāntis on impurity due to births and deaths; śāntis relating to horses and elephants; śāntis on weekdays; mahāśānti; Navagrahamakha; rules about Ayutahoma and its procedure, and about Lakṣahoma and Koṭihoma from Narasiṁhapurāṇa, Devīpurāṇa and Bhaviṣya-purāṇa;[1172b] Vasor-dhārā from Devīpurāṇa. The adbhutas mentioned in *kāṇḍikā* 93 (of the Kauśika-sūtra) are: showers (of ghee, honey, meat, gold, blood and other terrible showers); yakṣas (supernatural apparitions like apes, beasts, crows appearing in the form of human beings); croaking of two frogs; wrangling of family members; earth-quake; eclipse of the sun; eclipse of the moon; auṣasī (day-break, morning?) does not go up; when *samā* (year?) becomes terrible; when there is fear of inundations; when brāhmaṇas are armed; when images of gods dance, fall down, laugh, sing or present other forms; where two ploughshares get entangled; where two ropes or two threads (become entangled); where one Agni comes in contact with another; when a cow gives birth to twins; when a

---

1172 b. *Vasordhārā* (literally a stream of wealth). Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1253 n 2696 for it. It is described at great length in Rājanīti-prakāśa pp. 447–457, quoting Devīpurāṇa, and in Kṛtyakalpataru (Rājadharmakāṇḍa p. 201–212) quoting Bhaviṣya. It is an ancient idea, as Tai. S. V. 4. 8 mentions it 'वसोर्धारां जुहोति वसोर्मे धाराऽसदिति &c.'. The शान्तिमयूख p. 43 prescribes the following mantras in Vasordhārā, viz. 9 mantras of the hymn beginning with 'Agnim-īḷe' (Ṛg. I. 1. 1–9), the six mantras in Ṛg. I. 154, 1–6 (Vi ṇor-nu kam), the 15 mantras of Ṛg. II. 33, the nine mantras of Ṛg. IX. 1 (svādiṣṭhayā madiṣṭhayā), the Mahāvaiśvā-narasāma and Jyeṣṭhasāma. On p. 210–11 of the कृत्यकल्प० (राजधर्म) the following verses occur 'वसुर्द्रन्यं घृतं वाज्यममृतं हविष्कामिकम्। तत्रधारा सदा देया वसोर्धारा हि सा मता। देया धारा सदा वत्स रिपुनाशाय विद्धि ताम्। विच्छेदो नित्यहोमस्य न कार्यस्तु कदाचन॥' अनुशासनपर्व.

mare, or a she-ass or a woman[1173] (gives birth to twins); when cows yield bloody[1174] milk; when a bull sucks the udder of a cow; where a cow sucks the udder of another cow; where (a cow, horse, mule or a person) smells at *ākāśaphena* (white scuttle fish bone supposed to be sea-foam); when ants behave in an unusual way; when blue[1175] bees act in an unusual way; where the honey bees act in an unusual way; when an *adbhuta* happens not known before (or that surpasses all previous records); when anything is torn (or shattered in pieces) in a village, residence, shed for sacred fires or meeting hall; when water spurts up in a waterless place; where sesame yield equal oil (?); where sacrificial offerings are polluted by being touched by birds, two-footed animals and quadrupeds; when the locks of hair (of a boy or girl) turn towards the left; when the sacrificial post strikes shoots; when a meteor is seen falling by day; when a comet darkens the Great Bear; when the nakṣatras fall frequently (from the sky);[1175a] when a bird alights (on one's house) with flesh in its beak; when a light flashes without there being any fire; where Agni seems to breathe (or hiss) as it were; where clarified butter, oil or honey trickles; where village fire burns down a house; where accidental fire burns one's house; where a bamboo splits open with a sound; where a jar splits in a reservoir of water or a pan (when put on fire) splits or a vessel in which barley is put splits.[1176]

1173. Compare कात्यायनश्रौतसूत्र 'भार्यागोपु यमजनने मारुतं त्रयोदशकपालं निर्वपेत्' 25. 4. 35 with कौशिक 93. 17-18 यमवत्सायां गवि। वडवागर्दभ्योर्मानुष्यां च'.

1174. Compare कौशिक 43. 19 'यत्र धेनवो लोहितं दुहते' with शतपथ XII. 4. 2. 1 'तदाहुर्यस्याग्निहोत्री लोहितं दुहीत किं तत्र कर्म का प्रायश्चित्तिरिति' &c.

1175. 'Nīlamakṣānācāre' Kauśika 93. 24; makṣā (as a collector of honey) occurs in Ṛg. X. 40. 6 'Yuvor ha makṣā paryaśvinā madhvāsā bharata niṣkṛtam na yoṣaṇā'.

1175 a. नक्षत्रेषु पतापतेषु। कौशिक 93. 35; वार्तिक 6 on पा. VI. 1. 12 is चरिचलिपतिवदीनामच्याक् चाभ्यासस्य and पतञ्जलि gives the instances as चराचर, चलाचल, पतापत, वदावद.

1176. Many gṛhyasūtras have passages resembling those in कौशिक For example, मानवगृह्य II. 15. 6 has यद्यर्चा दह्येद्वा नश्येद्वा प्रपतेद्वा प्रभज्येद्वा प्रहसेद्वा प्रचलेद्वा द्वारवंशो वा स्फुटेत्। गौर्वा गां धयेत्। स्त्री वा स्त्रियमाहन्यात्। कर्तसंसर्गे हलसंसर्गे मुसलसंसर्गे मुसलप्रपतने मुसले वात्र शीर्येतान्यस्मिंश्चाद्भुत एताभिर्जुहुयात्।. Then ten आहुतिs with ten मन्त्रs are prescribed viz. Ṛg. I. 89. 6, V. 51. 11, V. 51. 12, V. 51.13, X. 63. 15, VI. 47. 11, VII. 19. 7, X. 152. 4, X. 180. 2, and Tai. Br. III. 5.11. Some of these like Ṛg. X. 152. 4 and X. 180. 2 occur in all Saṁhitās,

(*Continued on next page*)

It would be impossible for reasons of space and also of usefulness to set out the śāntis prescribed for the above *adbhutas* in Kauśika, but a few may be described by way of illustration. When there is an earthquake[1177] one should offer (oblations of ghee) with five verses, three of which are addressed to Jiṣṇu (Viṣṇu). Three of the verses are: "Just as the sun shines brightly in the heaven, Vāyu dwells in the sky and Agni enters the earth, so may this Jiṣṇu be firm and unmoving. As the rivers day and night pour their sediment (clay or mud carried by them) in the sea without fail, similarly may all tribes (of gods?) with one mind approach my invocation (or sacrifice) without fail; may the Goddess (Earth) along with all deities be firm and unmoving for me and may (the Goddess) drive away from us all evil and pierce my enemies that hate me." After having offered oblations with the words '*svāhā* to the earth' he should offer oblations with the verses Atharva VI. 87. 1, VI. 88. 1 and with the verses of the *anuvāka* beginning with Atharva XII. 1. 1. This is the prāyaścitti there (in case of an earthquake).

Where darkness seizes the sun, one should offer oblations with the verses 'arranging according to the season divine wonders, (the sun) rises up revolving (driving away) the fierce (aspects) of the several seasons; may the sun passing over these on all sides come; may the Waters move along in all these worlds. May Indra and Agni, knowing well, protect thee with herbs (remedies); destroy all darkness according to the cosmic order and by true speech.' Having offered oblations with the words 'svāhā to the sun', he should again make oblations (in Agni) with the hymn Atharva XVII. 1. He worships with the Rohita hymns (Atharva XIII. 1–4). This is the *prāyaścitti* in this case.

(Continued from last page)

कौशिक 93. 26 is 'अनाज्ञाते'. The शान्ति for all अद्भुतs not specified in the well-known works is contained in कौशिक, Kaṇḍikā 119. 'यद् ग्रन्थे न पठ्यते तत्सर्वमनाज्ञातमित्युच्यते'. The शान्ति is 'यदनाज्ञातमनाम्नातमर्थस्य कर्मणो मिथः। अग्ने त्वं नस्तस्मात्पाहि स हि वेत्थ यथायथम्। अग्नये स्वाहा। वायो सूर्य चन्द्रेति च। पुरुषसंमितोऽर्थः कमार्थः पुरुषसंमितः। वायुर्मा तस्मात्पातु स हि वेत्थ यथायथम्॥ वायवे स्वाहा। अग्निर्मा सूर्यो मा चन्द्रो मेति च।'. Compare 'यदनाज्ञातं यदाज्ञातं यज्ञस्य क्रियते मिथु। अग्ने तदस्य कल्पय त्वं हि वेत्थ यथायथम्। पुरुषसंमितो यज्ञः यज्ञः पुरुषसंमितः। अग्ने तदस्य'''यथम्॥' तै. ब्रा. III. 7. 11. 26–27.

1177. Vide कौशिकसूत्र chap. 98 for भूमिचलशान्ति, chap. 99 and 100 for śāntis in the case of solar eclipse and lunar eclipse respectively. ऋग्वेद X. 173 contains mantras similar to those in कौशिक 98.

When the (darkness) floods the moon one should offer oblation into fire with the verse[1178] "Rāhu creeps over the shining king (the moon), the former (Rāhu) strikes him (the moon) here (i. e. before us); a thousand of his (Rāhu's) bodies are to be destroyed; may (his) one hundred bodies perish!'. Having offered oblations with the words 'svāhā to, the Moon', he should offer oblations with the hymn 'Śakadhūmam nakṣatrāṇi yad-rājānam-akurvata' (Atharva VI. 128. 1). This is the prāyaścitta in this case.[1179]

In connection with śāntis three words require to be carefully understood viz. *adbhuta*, *utpāta* and *nimitta*. Adbhuta is an ancient word. It occurs several times in the Ṛgveda and is generally applied to some gods in the sense of 'wonderful'. In some passages, however, it means 'future' and possibly also 'portentous'. For example, according to Nirukta I. 5[1180] the sage Agastya first promised to offer an offering to Indra, but later he desired to offer the same to the Maruts, that then Indra came to Agastya and complained to him as in Ṛg. I. 170. 1 (what was promised today) even that does not exist, nor will it (the *havis*) be there (for me) tomorrow; who knows (for certain)

1178. There is difference of opinion about शकधूम in 'शकधूमं नक्षत्राणीत्येतेन सूक्तेन जुहुयात्' कौशिक 100. 3 Literally it may mean 'the smoke from dried cowdung' (शकन् = शकृत् + धूम). It occurs also in कौशिक 8. 17 and 50. 65, which latter is 'उपोत्तमेन शुद्धो ब्राह्मणस्य शकृत्पिण्डान् पर्वस्वाधाय किमद्याहरिति पृच्छति।'. This shows that here at least the meaning is 'a ब्राह्मण on whose joints dried cowdung cakes were placed.' Charpentier has an interesting paper on शकधूम in Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies (London) for 1935 pp. 449–450 where he states that various scholars have given different meanings, viz. constellation, dung smoke, weather prophet (Bloomfield), Agni (Caland), milky way and himself that it means 'Kṛttikā.'. It does not clearly appear how, conceding that शकधूम stands for कृत्तिका, a ब्राह्मण could be called शकधूम in कौशिक 50. 15 and on what grounds. According to Pāṇini IV. 3. 34 a man born on Bahulā nakṣatra was called Bahula; so one born on Śakadhūma (Kṛttikā) may be called by the same name by analogy. सोम is called the lord of plants in शतपथ VII. 2. 4. 26 and पारस्करगृह्य I. 5, and the king of brāhmaṇas (सोमोऽस्माकं ब्राह्मणानां राजा) in शतपथ V. 3. 4. 12 and V. 4. 2. 3.

1179. For a śānti on eclipse from a late medieval work, vide पुरुषार्थचिन्तामणि (pp. 355–361) quoting from मत्स्य.

1180. निरुक्त I. 5 says 'अगस्त्य इन्द्राय हविर्निरुप्य मरुद्भ्यः संप्रदित्सांचकार स इन्द्र एत्य परिदेवयांचक्रे। न नूनमस्ति नो श्वः कस्तद्वेद यदद्भुतम्। अन्यस्य चित्तमभि संचरेण्यमुताधीतं वि नश्यति॥ (ऋ. १. १७०. १)। न नूनमस्त्यद्यतनं नो एव श्वस्तनम्। ...कः तद् वेद यद् अद्भुतम्। इदमपि इतरद् अद्भुतम् अभूतमिव। निरुक्त I. 6. Ṛgveda I. 170 has five verses which contain an interesting dialogue between Indra and Agastya.

what will happen in future'. Yāska paraphrases 'adbhuta' by the word '*abhūta*' (that has not taken place) and remarks that the word 'adbhuta' in popular speech also means 'something that has not happened before'. Ṛg. I. 25. 11[1181] says 'the intelligent man expects from this (Varuṇa) all wonders (or portentous happenings), whether already performed or to be performed'. Ṛg. X. 105. 7 is perhaps a little clearer than the preceding. '(May Indra reduce our sins) Indra who is golden-bearded, who has tawny horses, whose jaw is never broken and who made against the *dasyu* for easily killing him a thunderbolt like the sky that is wonderful (or full of portents)'. The word usually employed in the Gṛhyasūtras is *adbhuta* and the śāntis are called 'adbhutaśāntis'. Adbhuta is a word of very general import. It includes not only such serious phenomena as earth-quakes, eclipses, comets, falling stars but such comparatively minor yet unexpected or unusual happenings as a cow yielding blood-red milk or a cow sucking the udder of another cow. The ancient writer Vṛddha-Garga defines 'adbhuta' as any occurrence that had not occurred before or a total change coming over what has occurred before.[1182] The 67th Ātharvaṇa-pariśiṣṭa is called Adbhutaśānti (pp. 432-435). It distributes 'adbhutas' into seven groups relating to Indra, Varuṇa, Yama, Agni, Kubera, Viṣṇu and Vāyu and names some adbhutas under each such as a rainbow at night (relating to Indra), a vulture or owl alighting on a man's house or a kapota entering it (relating to Yama), smoke without fire (relating to Agni), eclipse on the nakṣatra of a man's birth (relating to Viṣṇu) and prescribes as śānti the *japa* of Atharvaśiras, making brāhmaṇas say 'svasti,' honouring and feeding brāhmaṇas. That pariśiṣṭa is based on the Adbhutabrāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda.

The word 'utpāta' is rare in the Śrauta or Gṛhya sūtras. The Gautamadharma-sūtra, after enjoining upon the king to

---

1181. अतो विश्वान्यद्भुता चिकित्वाँ अभि पश्यति । कृतानि या च कर्त्वा ॥ ऋ. I. 25. 11; वज्रो यश्चक्रे सुहनाय दस्यवे हिरीमशो हिरीमान्। अरुतहनुरद्भुतं न रजः ॥ ऋ. X. 105. 7.

1182. तत्र वृद्धगर्गः । अभूतपूर्वं यत्पूर्वं यत्पूर्वं जायतेन्यथा। तदद्भुतमिति प्रोक्तं नैमित्तैस्याभिमित्तजम् ॥ q. by अद्भुतसागर p. 4. अथर्वपरिशिष्ट (p. 344ff) provides how certain portents indicated evil and death to the kings of certain countries. Vide the 'Reports of the Magicians and astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon' referred to above in note 839. Prof. Neugebauer refers to Babylonian tablets containing thousands of omens and observes that from about 700 B. C. systematic observational reports were made by astronomers to the royal court, in which no clear line of demarcation was drawn between astronomical and meteorological phenomena. Vide E. S. A. p. 96.

select a learned, well-conducted brāhmaṇa as his *purohita*, provides that the king should give heed to what astrologers and interpreters of omens tell (him) and that the purohita should perform śānti rites, rites for prosperity (such as vāstu-homa) and magic rites (on behalf of the king[1183]). But in the Purāṇas and the medieval Sanskrit works it is far more frequent than the word adbhuta; sometimes *adbhūta* and *utpāta* are used as synonyms. Garga says[1184] 'deities become unfavourable owing to the wrong doings of men and create extraordinary happenings in the sky, atmospheric region and on the earth. These are the utpātas for all worlds created by gods; these utpātas sally forth for the destruction (of people) and they by their (terrific) appearances rouse people (to do what is proper.)'. Here the words 'adbhuta' and 'utpāta' are used as synonyms. Similarly, Matsya (228. 1-2) appears to regard the two words as synonyms.[1185] Generally, however, the word utpāta denotes ccurrences that portend evil to all. Amarakośa treats 'ajanya', 'utpāta' and 'upasarga' as synonyms. Utpāta is defined by Garga, Varāhamihira[1186] and Atharva-pariśiṣṭa LXIV as the

---

1183. Vide p. 543 note 799 above for the passage from गौ. ध. सू. where the word उत्पात occurs.

1184. ततोऽपचारे मर्त्यानामपरज्यन्ति देवताः। ते सृजन्त्यद्भुतान् भावान्दिव्यभूम्यन्तरिक्षगान्॥ त एव सर्वलोकानामुत्पाता देवनिर्मिताः। विचरन्ति विनाशाय रूपैः सम्बोधयन्ति च॥ गर्ग q. by उत्पल on बृहत्सं. 45. 3; very similar verses are quoted from गर्गसंहिता and बार्हस्पत्य in अद्भु. सा. p. 5. मत्स्य chap. 229 summarises what वृद्धगर्ग told अत्रि and verse 5 is just like the first verse above; it is पुरुषापचाराक्षियतमपरज्यन्ति देवताः। ततोपरागाद्देवानामुपसर्गः प्रवर्तते॥; the बृहत्संहिता 45. 2-3 'अपचारेण नराणामुपसर्गः पापसञ्चयाद्भवति। संसूचयन्ति दिव्यान्तरिक्षभौमास्त उत्पाताः॥ मनुजानामपचारादपरक्ता देवताः सृजन्त्येतान्।. It would be noticed that Varāha repeats almost the very words of वृद्धगर्ग. The शल्यपर्व (37. 14-15) speaks of a तीर्थ called गर्गस्रोतस् visited by बलराम on the Sarasvatī and credits him with proficiency in the movements of luminaries and अनुशासन 18. 38 speaks of him as proficient in कालज्ञान with its 64 aṅgas. Garga was a famous gotra name. Vide Pāṇ. IV. 1. 105 (Gargādibhyo yañ).

1185. दिव्यान्तरिक्षभौमेषु या शान्तिरभिधीयते। तामहं श्रोतुमिच्छामि महोत्पातेषु केशव॥ अथातः संप्रवक्ष्यामि त्रिविधामद्भुतादिषु। विशेषेण तु भौमेषु शान्तिः कार्या तथा भवेत्॥ मत्स्य 228. 1-2.

1186. यानत्रेरुत्पातान्गर्गः प्रोवाच तानहं वक्ष्ये। तेषां संक्षेपोयं प्रकृतेरन्यत्वमुत्पातः॥ बृहत्सं. 45. 1; यः प्रकृतिविपर्यासः सर्वः संक्षेपतः स उत्पातः। क्षितिगगनदिव्यजातो यथोत्तरं गुरुतरो भवति॥ समाससंहिता of वराह q. by उत्पल on बृहत्सं. 45. 1. This verse is quoted in the अ. सा. p. 5 as taken from a work called वटकणिका; and the अ. स. ascribes the verse to वराह himself on the same page lines 3-4 'अत एव यः प्रकृवि-

(*Continued on next page*)

reverse of the usual natural order. *Nimitta* means, according to Amarakośa (nimittam hetulakṣmaṇoḥ) 'cause or prognostic sign'. Nimitta may be auspicious or inauspicious. This is one distinction between utpāta (which generally denotes an unlucky portent) and nimitta. There is another distinction. Nimitta is often restricted to the throbbing of a person's limbs (as in Matsya chap. 241), though here and there it is used in a wider sense as in Gītā (I. 31) ('nimittāni ca paśyāmi viparītāni Keśava' O Kesava! I see adverse omens), Rāmāyaṇa, Ayodhyākāṇḍa. 4. 17-19, Bhīṣma-parva 2. 16-17, Virāṭa 46. 30, Atharvapariśiṣṭa LXIV (Utpāta-lakṣaṇa) 10. 9-10.[1187] It may be noted that Manu VI. 50 mentions 'utpāta' and 'nimitta' separately (p. 527 note 758).

Examples of unfavourable happenings (nimittas or utpātas) occur plentifully in the Mahābhārata, Sabhāparva 80. 28-31, 81. 22-25, Vanaparva 179. 41, 224. 17-18, Virāṭa .39. 4-6, 46. 24-32, Udyoga 84. 4-9, 156. 28-30, Bhīṣma 2. 17-33, 3. 65-74, 19. 36-38, 99. 21-28, 112. 6-12, Droṇa 7. 34-41, 77. 3-7, Śalya 23. 21-24, 56. 8-14, 192. 17-21, Mausala 1. 1-5, 2. 1-17 and the Rāmāyaṇa, Ayodhyā 4. 17-19, Araṇyakāṇḍa 23. 1-7 and 10-25, Yuddhakāṇḍa 10. 14-20, 23. 4-11, 35. 25-35, 41. 13-20, 53. 32, 65. 47-51, 95. 43, 96. 40-44. The chief *utpātas* and *adbhutas*, are: terrible dreams, roar of contending winds i. e. hurricanes

---

(*Continued from last page*)

विपर्यासः प्रायः संक्षेपतः', 'इह वटकणिकायां वराहेण प्रायः शब्दः प्रयुक्त इति.' This indicates that वराहमिहिर wrote a work called वटकणिका which is the same as the समाससंहिता of वराह quoted by उत्पल. This important point will be elaborated elsewhere. प्रकृतेरन्यथाभावो यत्र यत्रोपजायते। तत्र तत्रापि जानीयात् सर्वमुत्पातलक्षणम्॥ अथर्वपरिशिष्ट (chap. LXIV. I. 2 p. 409); प्रकृतेरन्यथोत्पातः संक्षेपस्तावदीदृशः। गर्ग q. by अद्भुतसागर p. 5. The निमित्त of भद्रबाहु states very similarly 'प्रकृतेर्योऽन्यभावो विकारः सर्व उच्यते।' (II. 2) and 'प्रकृतेर्यो विपर्यासः स उत्पातः प्रकीर्तितः। दिव्यान्तरिक्षभौमाश्च व्यासमेषां निबोधत॥' (XIV. 2) The विष्णुपु० II. 5. 26 speaks of गर्ग as an ancient sage and as having known all the consequences of nimittas 'यमाराध्य पुराणर्षिर्गर्गो ज्योतींषि तत्त्वतः। ज्ञातवान् सकलं चैव निमित्तपठितं फलम्॥.'

1187. निमित्तानि समालोक्य कृत्वा पावनमादितः। महाशान्तिं प्रयुञ्जीत सर्वोपद्रवनाशिनीम्॥ सर्वरोगप्रशमनीमुत्पातफलनाशिनीम्। रौद्रीं कुर्यान्महाशान्तिं श्रद्धया बहुदक्षिणाम्॥ अथर्वपरिशिष्ट LXIV (उत्पातलक्षण) 10. 9-10. In भीष्मपर्व 2. 16-17, we read इह युद्धे महाराज भविष्यति महान् क्षयः। तथेह च निमित्तानि भयदान्युपलक्षये॥ श्येना गृध्राश्च काकाश्च कङ्काश्च सहिता बकैः। सम्पतन्ति नगाग्रेषु समवायांश्च कुर्वते॥; in वनपर्व 155. 2-5 sveral portents such as fall of meteors, sun becoming pale, earthquake, rain *of dust are described and in verse 6 they are referred to* as उत्पात and अद्भुत 'अन्ये च बहवो भीमा उत्पातास्तत्र जज्ञिरे। तदद्भुतमभिप्रेक्ष्य धर्मयुद्धे युधिष्ठिरः॥'.

(*nirghāta*), meteors, she-jackals howling towards the south, fierce and dry wind with shower of sand; earth-quakes; sun eclipse at an unusual time (Rāmāyaṇa III. 23. 12, Sabhā 80. 29, 81. 23 Śalya 56. 10, Bhīṣma 3. 28); flashes of lightning without clouds; carnivorous birds like vultures and crows on temples; fort-walls and bastions; spontaneous fire; rent banners; halo of the sun and moon; river-flowing with bloody waters; rain without clouds, rain of blood or mud; trumpeting of elephants; sky filled with darkness; horses shedding tears; poals of thunder in a clear sky, rivers flowing in reverse direction; throbbing of the left arm and eye (in men); croaking of frogs; sea lashed into fury; images of gods trembling, dancing, laughing or weeping (Bhīṣma 112. 11); pale sun, birds like pigeons and *mainas* and deer weeping with face towards the sun; appearance of a headless trunk near the sun; strange births such as ass born of a cow, mouse born of an ichneumon (Yuddhakāṇḍa 35. 30). The auspicious signs described in the epics, are comparatively few as in Bālakāṇḍa 22.4, Udyoga 83. 23-26, 84. 117, Bhīṣma 3. 65-74, Śānti 52. 25, Āśvamedhika 53. 5-6. The principal auspicious signs are: clear sky without clouds, wind blowing[1188] cool and pleasant to the skin, no dust raised, birds and animals proceeding to a man's right side, fire without being enveloped in smoke and with flames turned towards the right, shower of flowers, auspicious birds like *cāṣa*, *krauñca*, peacock sending up chirpings to the right (Karṇa 72. 12-13).

The omens and portents mentioned in the two epics are generally described as occurring at certain important times and events, e. g. on the eve of battles or when Daśaratha proposed that Rāma be crowned as *yuvarāja*, or when Pāṇḍavas startad on their exile into the forest or when Bhīṣma was anointed as commander-in-chief of the Kaurava hosts or when Arjuna vowed that he would kill Jayadratha before sunset. There is no gradation or order in mentioning the omens and portents in these two works, but they are set out pell-mell. Untimely rain, thunder without clouds, croaking of frogs are on the same level and

1188. ववौ शिवः सुखो वायुः सर्वगन्धवहः शुचिः। शान्तिपर्व 52. 25; शिवश्चानुववुर्वायुः प्रशान्तमभवद्रजः। प्रदक्षिणानुलोमाश्च मङ्गल्या मृगपक्षिणः। प्रयाणे वासुदेवस्य बभूवुरनुयायिनः॥ उद्योग. 83. 23-24 and 26 मन्त्राहुतिमहाहोमैर्हूयमानश्च पावकः। प्रदक्षिणमुखो भूत्वा विधूमः समपद्यत॥ ; रघुवंश III. 14 (दिशः प्रसेदुर्मरुतो ववुः सुखाः प्रदक्षिणार्चिर्हविरग्निराददे। बभूव सर्वं शुभशंसि तत्क्षणं भवो हि लोकाभ्युदयाय तादृशाम्॥) seems to be an echo of the above verses; compare also रघु० IV. 25, X. 72-74.

uttered in the same breath with eclipses. But Garga,[1189] Parāśara, Sabhā-parva, Bṛhatsaṁhitā 45. 2, Matsyapurāṇa 229.5, Atharva-pariśiṣṭa LXIX (1. 2) and other works divide *utpātas* into three classes, viz. *divya* (arising from heavenly bodies), *āntarikṣa* (springing in the sky or atmospheric region) and *bhauma* (that appear on the earth). This classification is ancient enough. The Atharvaveda[1190] expressly refers to the three classes of utpātas 'May the earthly and atmospheric utpātas and the planets moving in heaven confer welfare on us'. The Bṛhatsaṁhitā[1191] says that it is the king's business to arrange for śāntis in his kingdom for counteracting (the consequences of portents). Garga[1192] declared that those who, when advised by brāhmaṇas for performing śāntis, perform auspicious rites with faith do not suffer defeat, but that those who having no faith or because of atheism or resentment do not perform rites for counteracting (omens) perish in a short time. Garga, the Bṛhatsaṁhitā, Matsya 229. 6–9, Agni 263. 12–13 furnish examples of the three kinds of utpātas,[1193] viz. the *divya* ones are concerned with the abnormal conditions of planets and nakṣatras, eclipses, comets; those of atmospheric regions are hurricanes, unusual clouds, fall of meteors, twilights, preternatural reddish appearances of the quarters, halo, Fata Morgana (appearance of illusory town in the air), rainbow and strange rainfall (such as

---

1189. तेषां द्यौरन्तरिक्षं भूरेताश्चाश्रयः। पञ्चमहाभूतानि योनिः। पराशर; त्रिविधः स तु विज्ञेयो दिव्यनाभसभूमिजः। गर्ग, both q. by अद्भुतसागर p. 5; दिव्यान्तरिक्षभौमं च त्रिविधं संप्रकीर्तितम्। मत्स्य 229. 6; उत्पातांस्त्रिविधान्प्राह नारदो भगवानृषिः। दिव्यांश्चैवान्तरिक्षांश्च पार्थिवांश्च पितामह॥ सभापर्व 46. 8–9.

1190. उत्पाताः पार्थिवान्तरिक्षाः शं नो दिविचरा ग्रहाः। अथर्व. 19. 9. 7.

1191. तत्प्रतिघाताय नृपः शान्तिं राष्ट्रे प्रयुञ्जीत। बृहत्सं. 45. 3.

1192. ये तु सम्बोधिता विप्रैः शान्तये मङ्गलानि च। श्रद्दधाना प्रकुर्वन्ति न ते यान्ति पराभवम्। ये तु न प्रतिकुर्वन्ति क्रियामश्रद्धयान्विताः। नास्तिक्यादथवा कोपाद्विनश्यन्त्यथवाऽचिरात्॥ गर्ग q. by उत्पल on बृहत्सं. 45. 4, in अद्भु. सा. p. 6 (with slight variations, such as विमोहात् for कोपात्), ज्योतिस्तत्त्व p. 707.

1193. स्वर्भानु-केतु-नक्षत्र-ग्रहतारार्कचन्द्रजम्। दिवि चोत्पद्यते यच्च तद्दिव्यमिति कीर्तयेत्॥ वाय्वभ्रसन्ध्यादिग्दाहपरिवेषतमांसि च। खपुरं चेन्द्रचापं च तद्विद्यादन्तरिक्षजम्। भूमावुत्पद्यते यच्च स्थावरं वाथ जङ्गमम्। तदेकदेशिकं भौमं भूमिचालाम्बुविक्रिया। गर्गसंहिता q. by उत्पल on बृहत्सं. 45. 4–5, अ. सा. p. 6; दिव्यं ग्रहर्क्षवैकृतमुल्कानिर्घातपवनपरिवेषाः। गन्धर्वपुर-पुरन्दरचापादि यदान्तरिक्षं तत्। भौमं चरस्थिरभवं तच्छान्तिभिराहतं शममुपैति। नाभसमुपैति मृदुतां शाम्यति नो दिव्यमित्येके॥ दिव्यमपि शममुपैति प्रभूतकनकान्नगोमहीदानैः। रुद्रायतने भूमौ गोदोहात्कोटिहोमाच्च॥ बृहत्सं. 45. 4–6; मत्स्य 229. 6–9 ग्रहर्क्षवैकृतं दिव्यमान्तरिक्षं निबोध मे। उल्कापातो दिशां दाहः परिवेषस्तथैव च॥ गन्धर्वनगरं चैव वृष्टिश्च विकृता च या। एवमादीनि लोकेऽस्मिन्नान्तरिक्षं विनिर्दिशेत्॥ चरस्थिरभवो भौमो भूकम्पश्चापि भूमिजः। जलाशयानां वैकृत्यं भौमं तदपि कीर्त्यते॥ q. by हेमाद्रि on व्रत vol. II p. 1076; अग्नि (263. 12–13) has same verses as मत्स्य.

of blood-red water, or fall of rain with fishes, tortoises &c.); those of the earth are earth-quake and unusual states of water reservoirs. The Bṛhatsaṁhitā remarks that the evil consequences of earthly (*bhauma*) utpātas when counteracted with śāntis are removed, the evil consequences of utpātas from the atmospheric regions are reduced to a mild form (by śāntis), while, according to some (ācāryas like Kāśyapa, says Utpala) *divya* utpātas are not counteracted by śāntis at all; the opinion of Varāhamihira himself appears to be that the consequences of even *divya* utpātas are conjured away by the gifts of plenty of gold, food, cows and land and by spilling the milk of cows on the ground or in a Rudra temple and by performing *Koṭihoma*. Varāhamihira and Matsya further provide that daiva utpāta has evil effects (lit. bears fruit) in eight ways, viz. on the king himself, his son, his treasury, his conveyances (horses, elephants &c,), his capital, his queen, purohita and his people.[1194]

Numerous śāntis bearing different names are prescribed in Matsya, by Varāhamihira and others. The 18 śāntis prescribed in Matsya (228)[1194a] and bearing the names of several gods will be briefly mentioned here. Abhaya-śānti is prescribed when a king desires to be a conqueror or when he is attacked by enemies or when he fears that witchcraft has been practised against him or when he desires to uproot his enemies or when a great danger threatens. The *Saumya* śānti is prescribed when a man is attacked by Tuberculosis or is weak owing to wounds or when a man desires to perform a sacrifice. When there is an earthquake or when there is a famine of food or there is excessive rain or drought or there is danger of locusts or when thieves are operating the *Vaiṣṇavī* śānti is prescribed; *Raudrī* śānti is employed against an epidemic among cattle or human beings or when ghosts appear or when a coronation is to take place or when there is fear of an invasion or there is treachery in one's kingdom, or when enemies are to be killed; *Brāhmī* śānti is performed when it is feared that Veda study would

---

1194. आत्मसुतकोशवाहनपुरदारपुरोहितेपु लोके च। पाकमुपैति दैवं परिकल्पितमष्टधा नृपतेः॥ बृहत्सं. 45. 7. Compare मत्स्य 229. 12-13 राज्ञः शरीरे लोके च पुरद्वारे (v. l. पुरे दारे) पुरोहिते। पाकमायाति पुत्रेपु तथा वै कोपवाहने। q. by अ. सा. p. 9, हेमाद्रि on व्रत vol. II. p. 1076. There is close correspondence between the two here and elsewhere because both expressly say that they will draw upon what Garga declared to Atri.

1194a. The whole of Matsya 228 is quoted by Hemādri on Vrata vol II. pp. 1073-1075 and by अ. सा. pp. 733-736.

perish or when atheism prevails or where honour is paid to persons unworthy of it; if strong winds blow for more than three days and disease spreads due to *vāta*, then *Vāyavī* śānti should be performed; *Vāruṇī* when there is fear of drought or there is abnormal rain (of blood &c.); *Bhārgavī* when there is danger of false accusation; *Prājāpatyā* when abnormal births take place; *Tvāṣṭrī* when there are abnormal conditions of implements; *Kaumārī* when śānti is to be performed for children; *Āgneyī* when fire shows portentous appearances; *Gāndharvī* when a person is disobeyed or his wife and servants perish, or he desires to perform śānti for horses; *Āṅgirasī* when elephants are affected; *Nairṛtī* when danger arises from goblins; *Yāmyā* when there is fear of an accident leading to death or a bad dream; *Kauberī* when wealth is lost; *Pārthivī* when trees are affected by abnormal conditions; *Aindrī* when portents happen on Jyeṣṭhā nakṣatra or on Anurādhā.

The Agnipurāṇa (263. 7–8) refers to these 18 śāntis and says that the best śāntis are Amṛtā, Abhayā and Saumyā. Varāhamihira mentions numerous śāntis on the happenings of several abnormal incidents. For reasons of space nothing can be said here about them. But one śānti deserves to be set out.[1195] 'If a man perceives Yakṣas, the astrologer should declare that an epidemic is very near; for counteracting them Garga performed a propitiatory rite, viz. Mahāśāntis, offerings, plentiful food, worship of Indra and Indrāṇī.' The Bṛhatsaṁhitā sets out (45. 82–95) certain happenings as not portentous when they happen in certain seasons and quotes several verses of Ṛṣiputra which also occur in Matsya 229. 14–25 with some variations; e. g. in Caitra and Vaiśākha the following are auspicious (and not portents requiring śānti) lightning, meteors, earthquake, blazing twilight, noisy storms, halo, dust in sky, smoke in forests, red sunrise and sunset.

1195. दृष्टेषु यातुधानेषु निर्दिशेन्मरकमाशु सम्प्राप्तम्। प्रतीघाताय चैषां गर्गः शान्तिं चकारेमाम्॥ महाशान्त्योऽथ बलयो भोज्यानि सुमहान्ति च। कारयेत महेन्द्रं च माहेन्द्रीं च समर्चयेत्॥ बृहत्सं. 45. 79–80.

CHAPTER XXI

Individual Śāntis

It is now time to turn to individual śāntis, mostly post-vedic. The first is Vināyaka-śānti or Gaṇapatipūjā. This is performed at the commencement of all saṁskāras such as *upanayana* and marriage in order that the fruit thereof may be had without obstacles or for averting the evil effects of portents or in order to mitigate the adverse effects of the death of a sapiṇḍa or the like. When it is performed for its own sake it should be performed on the 4th tithi of the bright half, on Thursday and the auspicious nakṣatras Puṣya, Śravaṇa, Uttarā, Rohiṇī, Hasta, Aśvinī, Mṛgaśīrṣa, but when performed at the commencement of Upanayana or the like, one may perform it at a time suited to the time of the principal rite. The *saṅkalpa* is given below.[1196] In H. of Dh. vol. II pp. 213–216 it has been shown how in the earliest stages represented by the Mānava-gṛhya and Baijavāpa-gṛhya which speak of four Vināyakas, all were evil spirits, how in the next stage represented by the Yājñavalkyasmṛti (I. 271–294). Vināyaka is not only represented as causing obstacles (Vighnakṛt) but also as bringing success in all actions and rites (Vighnahṛt) and how later on it was prescribed that Gaṇapatipūjā must be done first in all rites (Gobhila I. 13). Yāj. I. 293 provides[1197] that by worshipping Vināyaka in the way prescribed and also the planets, a person secures success in his undertakings and the highest prosperity. The Viṣṇudharmottara II. 105. 2–24 borrows the verses of Yāj. I. 271–292, though not in the same order and adds a few. The Brahmāṇḍa provides[1198]

1196. अथोपनयनविवाहादौ निर्विघ्नफलप्राप्त्यर्थमुपसर्गनिरासाय वा सपिण्डमरणादिनिमित्तकप्रातिकूल्यनिवृत्त्यर्थं वा विनायकशान्तिः कार्या। तत्र कालः शुक्लपक्षचतुर्थी गुरुवारः पुष्यश्रवणोत्तरारोहिणीहस्ताश्विनीमृगनक्षत्राणि शस्तानि। उपनयनादौ तु प्रधानकालानुरोधेन यथासम्भवकालो ग्राह्यः। तत्रामुककर्मणो निर्विघ्नफलसिद्ध्यर्थमिति वा उपसर्गनिवृत्त्यर्थमिति वा, अमुकसापिण्डमरणनिमित्ताशुचित्वप्रातिकूल्यनिरासार्थमिति वा सङ्कल्प ऊह्यः। धर्मसिन्धु p. 205; प्रातिकूल्य has a special meaning, for which vide H. of Dh. vol. II p. 516.

1197. एवं विनायकं पूज्य ग्रहांश्चैव विधानतः। कर्मणां फलमाप्नोति श्रियं चाप्नोत्यनुत्तमाम्॥ याज्ञ. I. 293, भविष्य, ब्राह्मपर्व 23. 30.

1198. जातकर्मादिसंस्कारे गर्भाधानादिकेऽपि च। यात्रायां वाणिज्यादौ युद्धे देवार्चने शुभे। संकष्टे कामसिद्ध्यर्थं पूजयेद्यो गजाननम्। तस्य सर्वाणि कार्याणि सिध्यन्त्येव न संशयः॥ ब्रह्माण्ड III. 42. 42–44; ब्रह्माण्ड (IV. 44. 65–70) gives 51 names of गणेश.

that Gajānana must be worshipped for success in all desires, in all *saṁskāras* such as Garbhādhāna and Jātakarma, when starting on a journey or engaging in a commercial undertaking, at the time of battle, in the worship of gods, in troublous times. The Bhaviṣyottara chap. 144 has a śānti called Gaṇanāthaśānti which resembles the Vināyakaśānti of Yāj.

In the Yājñavalkya-smṛti (I. 294-308), the Vaikhānasa-smārta-sūtra (IV. 13-14), the Baudhāyana-gṛhyaśeṣasūtra, the Matsya-purāṇa (93. 1-105), the Viṣṇudharmottara I. 93-105 and other purāṇas, in the Bṛhad-Yogayātrā (chap. 18. 1-24), and in the medieval digests provision is made for a śānti rite to the nine *grahas*, viz. the Sun, the Moon, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, Saturn (mentioned in the order of the week-days), Rāhu and Ketu. This *navagrahaśānti* is the model (*prakṛti*) of all śānti-homas in all medieval digests. The Vaikhānasa-smārtasūtra[1199] provides that all religious rites should be preceded by this nava-graha-śānti. Yājñavalkya[1200] says 'one desirous of prosperity, of removing evil or calamities, of rainfall (for crops), long life, bodily health and one desirous of performing magic rites against enemies and others should perform a sacrifice to planets.' The Matsya (93. 5-6) states that the *navagrahamakha* is of three kinds, viz *Ayutahoma* (in which 10000 oblations are made), Lakṣahoma and Koṭihoma. The first is described at length in Matsya 93. 7-84, Lakṣahoma in 93. 85-118, Koṭihoma in 93. 119-139. The Matsya further provides[1201] that Ayutahoma should be performed in marriages, festivals, sacrifices, establishment of images and other rites, in order that no obstacles should arise therein and on occasions when the mind is perturbed or when some evil omen or unusual event happens.

1199. ग्रहपूजां पुरस्कृत्य सर्वकर्मसंमारभंदिति विज्ञायते। वै. स्मा. सू. IV. 14; the शान्तिकमलाकर, says, 'अथ सर्वशान्तिप्रकृतिस्तु ग्रहयज्ञ उच्यते। तत्र स्कान्दयाज्ञवल्क्यौ श्रीकामः शान्तिकामो वा॰' (folio 11a).

1200. श्रीकामः शान्तिकामो वा ग्रहयज्ञं समाचरेत्। वृष्ट्यायुःपुष्टिकामो वा तथैवाभिचरन्नपि॥ याज्ञ. I. 294, मत्स्य 93. 2 (reads वृद्ध्यायुः॰ and चरन्पुनः). The मिताक्षरा explains: शान्तिकामः आपदुपशान्तिकामः सस्यादिवृद्ध्यर्थं प्रवर्षणं वृष्टिः ··· पुष्टिरनवद्यशरीरत्वम्; while अपरार्क says 'शान्तिः फलदानोन्मुखदुरितनिवारणं···पुष्टिः शरीराद्युपचयः'.

1201. विवाहोत्सवयज्ञेषु प्रतिष्ठादिषु कर्मसु। निर्विघ्नार्थं मुनिश्रेष्ठ तथोद्वेगाद्भुतेषु च। कथितोऽयुतहोमोऽयं लक्षहोममतः शृणु॥ मत्स्य 93. 84, भविष्य IV. 141. 86-87. The notes will show that several verses are common to both Yāj. and Matsya and the latter is far more elaborate than याज्ञ. or वै. स्मा. सू. It is probable that Yāj. is the earliest of the three, that वै. स्मा. सू. comes next and मत्स्य is the latest of the three.

The procedure in Yāj. being concise and probably the earliest among the extant works on *grahayajña* is set out here, with a few additions from Matsya and Vaikhānasa. The images of the nine planets should respectively be made of copper, crystal, red sandalwood, gold (for both Mercury and Jupiter), silver, iron, lead, bronze or (if all these be not available) they should be drawn on a piece of cloth with powders having colours appropriate to each planet or should be drawn on circles with fragrant substances (such as sandalwood paste). The Matsya[1202] (93. 11–12) prescribes that in drawing the images the Sun should be in the middle, that Mars, Jupiter, Mercury, Venus, Moon, Saturn, Rāhu and Ketu should be established with grains of rice respectively in the south, north, north-east, east, south-east, west, south-west and north-west. Yāj. (I. 298) proceeds garments, flowers and fragrant substances

Planet	Mantra in Yāj I. 299–301	Mantra in Matsya 93. 33–37.	Mantra in Vaikhānasa-smārta-sūtra IV. 14.
Sun	Ā kṛṣṇena, Ṛg. I. 35 2	Same.	Ā satyena (Tai. S. III. 4. 11. 2)
Moon	Imam devā, Vāj. S. IX 40, X. 18.	Āpyāyasva Ṛg. I. 91. 16 or IX. 31. 4.	Somo dhenum (Ṛg. I. 91. 20, Vāj. S. 34. 21)
Mars	Agnir-mūrdhā divaḥ kakut, Ṛg. VIII. 44. 16,	same	same
Mercury	Udbudhyasva, Vāj. S. 15.54, Tai. S. IV. 7.13.5	Agne Vivasvad-uṣasaḥ, Ṛg. I. 41. 1	Same as in Yāj.
Jupiter	Bṛhaspate ati yad-aryaḥ Ṛg. II. 23. 15.	Bṛahaspate pari dīyā rathena, Ṛg. X. 103. 4	Same as in Yāj.
Venus	Annāt pari-srutaḥ, Vāj. S. 19.75, Maitrā. S. III. 116.	Śukram te anyat, Ṛg. VI. 58. 1.	Same as in Matsya
Saturn	San-no devīr, Ṛg. X. 9. 4	same	same
Rāhu	Kāṇḍāt, Vāj. S. 13. 20, Tai. S. IV. 2. 9. 2,	Kayā naś-citra, Ṛg. IV. 31. 1.	Same as in Matsya
Ketu	Ketum kṛṇvan, Ṛg. I.6.3.	same	same

1202. मत्स्य 93. 11–12 are quoted by the मिताक्षरा on या. I. 297 and वै. स्मा. सू. (IV. 13) specifies the same as 'मध्याग्नेयदक्षिणैशान्योत्तरपूर्वपश्चिमनैर्ऋतवायव्याश्रिताः' in the order of the seven week days, राहु and केतु.

of the colour [1203] appropriate to each should be offered to the planets, also offerings should be made, *guggulu* is to be the incense for all planets and oblations of boiled rice accompanied with the mantras (specified below) should be offered respectively to the nine planets.

The Viṣṇudharmottara (I. 102, 7–10) gives the same mantras as Yāj. does, Bhaviṣya (IV. 141. 34–36) gives the same except for Rāhu, for which it gives 'Kayā naścitra,' as in Matsya. Padma (V. 82, 30–32) is same as Matsya. Yāj. then proceeds (I. 301–302) that in homa for each of the planets the fuel sticks (*samidh*)[1204] were to be 108 or 28 anointed with honey or clarified butter or with curds or with milk and they were respectively to be of the arka plant, palāśa, khadira, apāmārga, pippala, audumbara, śamī, dūrvā and kuśas for the sun, the moon and so on in order. A man [1205] of the three varṇas should honour brāhmaṇas according to the prescribed procedure (washing their feet &c.) and should feed them respectively (Yāj. I. 304) with boiled rice mixed with jaggery, or cooked in milk and sugar, sacrificial food (*haviṣya*), boiled rice from paddy becoming ripe in 60 days from sowing mixed with milk, boiled rice with curds, boiled rice with ghee, boiled rice with pounded sesame, rice mixed with meat, rice of various colours, for the sun, the moon and so on in order or with food that is available and according to his ability. The *dakṣiṇā* (fee) to the brāhmaṇas should be a milch cow, conch, draught bull, gold, garment (vāsas), a horse (white), dark cow, iron weapon, a lamb, in honour

---

1203. The colours appropriate to the nine planets and their presiding deities are stated by वै. स्मा. सू. as follows: रक्तसितातिरक्तश्यामपीतासितासितकृष्णधूम्रवर्णाः । अनलाप्पतिगुहहरीन्द्रशचीप्रजापतिशेषयमाधिदेवत्याः ॥. The मत्स्य slightly differs on both these; chap. 93. 16–17 provide that the colours are: red for the Sun and Mars, white for the Moon and Venus, yellowish for Mercury and Jupiter, dark for Saturn and Rāhu and smoky for Ketu. The presiding deities of nine planets according to Matsya (93. 13–14) are Śiva, Umā, Skanda, Hari, Brahmā, Indra, Yama, Kāla and Citragupta for the planets, Sun, Moon and so on respectively.

1204. कर्तव्या मन्त्रवन्तश्च चरवः प्रतिदैवतम् । अर्कः पलाशः खदिरस्त्वपामार्गोऽथ पिप्पलः । औदुम्बरः शमी दूर्वा कुशाश्च समिधः क्रमात् ॥ एकैकस्य त्वष्टशतमष्टाविंशतिरेव वा । होतव्या मधुसर्पिभ्यां दध्ना क्षीरेण वा युताः ॥ याज्ञ. I. 298, 301–302, मत्स्य 93, 32. 24–28. विष्णुधर्मोत्तर I. 101. 2–4 are very similar.

1205. शुद्धोदन-पायस-गुडौदन-दध्योदन-गौडिक-चित्रौदन-कृसरमाषौदन-कणौदनानि क्रमेण निवेदयेत् । वै. स्मा. सू. IV. 13; मत्स्य (93. 19–20) slightly differs from this and also from Yāj. मत्स्य (93. 38–41) prescribes Vedic mantras for the presiding deities of planets, which are mostly different from those in वै.स्मा.सू.

respectively of the sun, moon and so on. The Viṣṇudharmottara (I. 103. 1-6) contains the same fees.[1206] He should offer special worship to that planet that may be unfavourably situated (as regards his nakṣatra or horoscope) at a particular time. Yāj. winds up by saying that the rise and fall of kings depend on planets (vide note 800 for this verse). Viṣṇudharmottara (I. 106. 9-10) also has the same verse. Kṛtyakalpataru (on Śāntika, folio 5 b) quotes Bhaviṣya to the effect that planets are always favourable to him who abstains from injury to others, who is self-restrained, who acquires wealth by righteous means, and who always observes the *niyamas* (restrictive rules of conduct as in Yāj. III. 313). The Śāntimayūkha (p. 21) also quotes this verse.

The Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra (IV. 13) provides slightly different kinds of *naivedya* food for the nine planets (as in note 1205) and prescribes separate Vedic mantras for the presiding deities (of the planets) to whom oblations of ghee were to be offered. The Matsya remarks at the end of the description of Ayutahoma: 'just as armour is a protection against the wounds by arrows, so śānti (graha-yajña) is protection against the strokes of Fate.'[1207]

The Matsya (93.92) declares[1208] that Lakṣahoma is ten times of the Ayutahoma and Koṭihoma is one hundred times of Lakṣahoma in the matter of oblations, fees and rewards, that the procedure of invoking and bidding goodbye to the planets and presiding deities, the mantras for homa, bath and gifts are the same in Lakṣahoma and Koṭihoma. The Matsya gives[1209] the warning

---

1206. The दक्षिणा in वै. स्मा. सू. (IV. 14) is : रक्तधेनुमादित्याय शङ्खं सोमाय ताम्रमङ्गारकाय हिरण्यं बुधाय शुक्लं वासो बृहस्पतये हयं शुक्राय कृष्णां गां शनैश्चराय राहोश्छागं केतोरायसदण्डमिति।. मत्स्य (93. 60-62) slightly differs from both याज्ञ. and वै. स्मा. सू. as to दक्षिणा and prescribes Paurāṇika mantras that are to accompany these gifts (verses 64-72).

1207. यथा बाणप्रहाराणां कवचं भवति वारणम्। तद्वद् दैवोपघातानां शान्तिर्भवति वारणम्॥ मत्स्य 93. 81, विष्णुधर्मोत्तर I. 105. 14. मत्स्य 228. 29 is a similar verse 'बाणप्रहारा न भवन्ति यद्वत् राजन्नृणां संनहनैर्युतानाम्। दैवोपघाता न भवन्ति तद्वद्धर्मात्मनां शान्तिपरायणानाम्॥'.

1208. अस्माच्छतगुणः प्रोक्तः कोटिहोमः स्वयंभुवा। आहुतीभिः प्रयत्नेन दक्षिणाभिः फलेन च॥ पूर्ववद् ग्रहदेवानामावाहनविसर्जने। होममन्त्रास्त एवोक्ताः स्नाने दाने तथैव च। मत्स्य 93. 119-120.

1209. अन्नहीनो दहेद्राष्ट्रं मन्त्रहीनस्तु ऋत्विजः। यष्टारं दक्षिणाहीनं नास्ति यज्ञसमो रिपुः। न वाप्यल्पधनः कुर्याल्लक्षहोमं नरः क्वचित्। यस्मात्पीडाकरो नित्यं यज्ञे भवति विग्रहः॥ मत्स्य 93. 111-112 q. by कृत्यकल्प० (on शान्तिक) folio 10a.

that a sacrifice devoid of distribution of food burns (i. e. brings disasters on) the country, devoid of (proper) mantras burns the officiating priests, devoid of (proper) fees burns the sacrificer; there is no enemy as (disastrous as) a sacrifice and that a poor man should not start on a Lakṣahoma, since wrangling (about food or fees) in a sacrifice always causes trouble or misfortune (to the sacrificer). The Bṛhadyogayātrā of Varāha (chap. 18 verses 1–24) deals with *grahayajña* and closely follows Yāj. though some details are added here and there. Verses about the sun are quoted below (n 1213). The Yogayātrā also (chap. 6) deals with the same matter. The Agnipurāṇa (chap. 164) is a wholesale copy of Yāj. (I. 295–308). The Matsya (in chapter 239) again deals with Koṭi-homa which continues for a year. The Matsyapurāṇa (chap. 94) contains nine verses on the manner in which the figures of the nine planets were to be drawn or painted and these are quoted by the Mitākṣarā on Yāj. I. 297–298 and by Kṛtyakalpataru (on śānti) folio 5a. Vide Koṭihoma in list of vratas (p. 290).

The Grahayajña in Yāj. is short and simple, but in some purāṇas such as the Bhaviṣyottara (141. 6–85) and medieval and modern works it has become an elaborate affair by the addition of numerous details. One or two details may be pointed out. Each planet was supposed to have a gotra and was[1210] deemed to have been born in a certain country (vide note 875 p. 588 for the countries of the birth of planets). Therefore, in invoking the presence of each planet these two details have to be added (as specified below in the note for the sun by way of illustration). The gotras of the grahas from the Sun to Ketu are respectively Kāśyapa, Ātreya, Bhāradvāja, Ātreya, Āngirasa, Bhārgava, Kāśyapa, Paithīnasa, Jaimini. The Saṁskāra-tattva of Raghunandana (p. 946) sets out from Skanda the gotras and countries of birth of the nine grahas and provides that if worship is offered to them without mentioning the gotras and countries that would be disrespectful to them. The Grahayajña

1210. ग्रहपीठस्य मध्ये वर्तुले द्वादशाङ्गुले प्राङ्मुखं सूर्यं रक्तपुष्पाक्षतैः, आ कृष्णेन (ऋ. १. ३५. २) हिरण्यस्तूपः सविता त्रिष्टुप् सूर्यावाहने विनियोगः। ओम्। आ कृष्णेन०। ओं भूर्भुवः स्वः कलिङ्गदेशोद्भव काश्यपसगोत्र सूर्येहागच्छेह तिष्ठ सूर्याय नमः सूर्यमावाहयामीति सूर्यं स्थापयेत्। ऋग्वेदिनां ब्रह्मकर्म p. 145; it must be pointed out that Yāj. does not lay down a procedure for अयुतहोम, लक्षहोम, कोटिहोम nor does he even refer to them, as stated by शान्तिमयूख (p. 22) 'किं च याज्ञवल्क्यादिस्मृतिषु न तावदयुतहोमादीनां विधिर्नाप्यनुवादः।'.

may be simple (*kevala*) as in Yāj. or Ayutahoma or Lakṣahoma or Koṭihoma. A few further remarks are added here from the Agnipuarāṇa (chap. 149), Narasiṁha-purāṇa (chap. 35), Matsya (chap. 93 and 239), Bhaviṣyottara (chap. 141 and 142), Atharva-pariśiṣṭa XXXI (for Koṭihoma) and other works. The Kṛtyakalpataru[1211] (Rājdharma) quotes the Brahma-purāṇa as follows: The king should perform two Lakṣahomas every year and one Koṭihoma which confers freedom from the fear of all calamities and he should at once perform a Mahāśānti that removes all evil consequences when there are eclipses of the Sun and the Moon and an earthquake. The Agni (149.12) says 'Ayutahoma confers slight success, Laksahoma drives away all distress, while Koṭihoma tends to destroy all kinds of trouble and confers all desired objects.' The Viṣṇudharmottara (II. 36. 3–4) states that Aśvapati, father of the famous *pativratā* Sāvitrī performed a Lakṣahoma with the Sāvitrī (Gāyatrī) mantras for securing a son. 'There is no *utpāta* in the world that is not conjured away by Lakṣahoma; there is no more auspicious thing that surpasses Lakṣahoma. In the case of the king who gets a Koṭihoma performed by brāhmaṇas the enemies cannot stand up against him in battle: excessive rainfall, drought, mice, locusts, parrots, evil spirits and the like and all enemies on the battle-field are conjured away from him.'[1212] The Bhaviṣyottara (142. 11–12) calls koṭihoma a śānti rite, which yields all desired objects, by which even grave sins like brāhmaṇa-murder are removed at once, all utpātas are conjured away and great happiness follows. Bhaviṣyottara (chap. 142. 7–54) contains an elaborate procedure of Koṭihoma and also a briefer one (in chap. 142. 56–80). Atharva-pariśiṣṭa (No. 31) describes the procedure of Koṭihoma; it was to be begun on an auspicious tithi in the bright half, on the *muhūrta* called Vijaya and on one of the nakṣatras viz. Rohiṇī, Puṣya, Anurādhā, the three Uttarās, Abhijit, Mṛgaśiras, Śravaṇa, Citrā, Revatī. The firepit was to be of eight cubits (for Lakṣahoma half of this), the brāhmaṇas may be 20, 100, 1000 or even one crore, who

---

1211. ब्रह्मपुराणे। द्वौ लक्षहोमौ कुर्वीत तथा संवत्सरं प्रति। एकं च कोटिहोमं च सर्वाभयप्रदम्। ...ग्रहणे सूर्यशशिनोर्भूकम्पोत्पातदर्शने। तत्क्षणे च महाशान्तिः कर्तव्यानिष्टनाशिनी। राजधर्मकाण्ड of कृत्यकल्पतरु p. 166.

1212. नास्ति लोके स उत्पातो यो ह्यनेन न शाम्यति। मङ्गल्यं परमं नास्ति यदस्मादतिरिच्यते। कोटिहोमं तु यो राजा कारयेत्पूर्ववद् द्विजैः। न तस्य शत्रवः संख्ये जातु तिष्ठन्ति कर्हिचित्। अतिवृष्टिरनावृष्टिर्मूषकाः शलभाः शुकाः। राक्षसाद्याश्च शाम्यन्ति सर्वे च रिपवो रणे॥ अग्नि 149.5–8.

should offer fuel sticks anointed with ghee. The Bṛhadyogayātrā [1213] verses are quoted below.

Some of the medieval works like the Śāntimayūkha (p. 12) quote verses from the Skandapurāṇa that state how the unfavourable aspect of Saturn led Saudāsa to eat human flesh, that of Rāhu made Nala wander over the earth, that of Mars led to Rāma's banishment to forest, that of the Moon led to the death of Hiraṇyakaśipu, that of the Sun brought about the fall of Rāvaṇa, that of Jupiter led to the death of Duryodhana, that of Mercury made the Pāṇḍavas do work not fit for them, that of Venus led to the death of Hiraṇyākṣa in battle.

Some of the medieval digests (*nibandhas*) such as the Dharmasindhu lay down that certain special gifts should be made when any one of the planets is unfavourable to a person. They are set out here from the Dharmasindhu (p. 135). For the Sun—Ruby, wheat, cow, red garment, jaggery, gold, copper, red sandalwood, lotuses; for the Moon—rice grains in vessel made from bamboo, camphor, pearl, white garment, jar full of ghee, a bull; for Mars—coral, wheat, *masūra* pulse, red bull, jaggery, gold, red garment, copper; for Mercury—blue garment, gold, bronze vessel, *mudga* pulse, emerald, slave girl, ivory, flowers; for Jupiter—topaz, turmeric, sugar, horse, yellow corn and yellow garment, salt, gold; for Venus—garment of various colours, white horse, cow, diamond, gold, silver, unguents, rice grains; for Saturn—sapphire, māṣa beans, sesame and sesame oil, *kulittha* (pulse), she-buffalo, iron, dark cow; for Rāhu—*gomeda* (a kind of gem of four varieties), horse, blue garment, blanket, sesame and sesame oil, iron; for Ketu—cat's eye gem, sesame and sesame oil, blanket, musk, lamb, garments. In the author's youth these directions about dānas (gifts) were followed by many people and even now they are being followed to some extent. The Madanaratna (on Śāntika-pauṣṭika, folios 5 a to 7 a) gives separate śānti procedure for each of the *grahas* from the Sun to Ketu from the Bhaviṣyottara.

1213. तत्रार्चा ताम्रमयी सवितुः पालाशिकाः स्रुचः समिधः। आ कृष्णेनेति मन्त्रो रक्ता गन्धाः सहागुरुणा॥ माषातसीतिलाश्वकसमुद्गचणकान् विहाय भोज्यविधिः। बकुलार्कागस्त्यपलाशशल्लकीकुसुमपूजा च॥ अष्टशतमितेभ्यो विप्रेभ्यो दक्षिणाहिताग्निभ्यः। देया वृषकनकमयी सहस्रकिरणमुद्दिश्य॥ बृहद्योग॰ 18.3–5 (ms). It may be mentioned that the mantras for the nine grahas in बृहद्योग॰ do not agree completely either with Yāj. or with Matsya. They are आ कृष्णेन, आप्यायस्व, अग्निर्मूर्धा, उद्बुध्यस्व, बृहस्पते अति, अन्नात्परिस्रुतः, शन्नो देवीः, कया नश्चित्र, केतुं कृण्वन्नकेतवे. Compare table above on p. 750.

Another śānti refers to the placating of Saturn when that planet occupies the 12th, 1st and 2nd rāśis from the rāśi of a man's birth. This is roughly a period of seven years and a half and is called '*sārdha-saptavārṣika-pīḍā*' in Sanskrit and '*sāḍe-sātī*' in Marāṭhi. The śānti consists in worshipping an image of Saturn made of iron placed in a vessel of iron or clay, covered with two dark garments or a blanket and offering to it dark and fragrant flowers, food or rice mixed with sesame. That food and the image are to be donated to a dark brāhmaṇa or to some brāhmaṇa with the mantra 'śan no devīr' (Ṛg. X. 9. 4). If the worshipper be a śūdra he is to repeat a paurāṇika[1214] mantra (noted below) which refers to Nala getting back his kingdom by placating Saturn. This should be done every Saturday for a year or one should every day repeat the mantra containing ten names of Saturn (in note 1214) and should also repeat a Śanistotra (eulogy of Saturn) every morning. By doing so the trouble that Saturn causes for seven and half years is averted.

Some of the medieval digests try to furnish an accurate definition of Śānti. Only one may be cited here. The Śānti-mayūkha[1215] of Nilakaṇṭha (first half of 17th century A. D.) defines it as a rite prescribed by the śāstra, which (rite) has its motive or urge sinfulness that is not clear (i.e. that is only inferred or presumed), that removes evil effects relating only to this world, and the performance of which does not lead on to sin The first clauses excludes gifts made to remove diseases like tuberculosis;[1216] the 2nd clause distinguishes śāntis from sacri-

1214. The Paurāṇika mantra is: यः पुनर्नष्टराज्याय नलाय परितोषितः। स्वप्ने ददौ निजं राज्यं स मे सौरिः प्रसीदतु॥ नमोऽर्कपुत्राय शनैश्चराय नीहारवर्णाञ्जनमेचकाय। श्रुत्वा रहस्यं भव कामदस्त्वं फलप्रदो मे भव सूर्यपुत्र॥ धर्मसिन्धु p 135; the ten names of Saturn are कोणस्थः पिङ्गलो बभ्रुः कृष्णो रौद्रान्तको यमः। सौरिः शनैश्चरो मन्दः पिप्पलादेन संस्तुतः॥' q. by मदनरत्न on शान्तिकपौष्टिक folio 8a.

1215. अस्पष्टपापनैदानिकैहिकमात्रानिष्टनिवर्तकं पापाप्रयोजकं वैधं कर्म शान्तिकम्। क्षयादिहरदानादावतिप्रसङ्गं वारयितुं नैदानिकान्तम्। आमुष्मिकानिष्टनिवर्तकं वारयितुमैहिकेति। प्रायश्चित्तं वारयितुं मात्रपदम्। प्रायश्चित्तं तु आमुष्मिकानिष्टनिवर्तकमपि। अभिचारप्रत्यभिचारौ वारयितुं पापाप्रयोजकमिति। तयोः फलतो हिंसात्वेन तदनुष्ठाने प्रायश्चित्तोक्तेश्च पापप्रयोजकत्वात्। शान्तिमयूख p. 2.

1216. It was believed in ancient India that diseases and bodily defects were due to sins committed in past lives. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. IV pp.174-175. Yāj. (III. 207 and 209) remarks that the murderer of a brāhmaṇa suffers from tuberculosis after passing through the births of deer, dog, hog, and camel. मृगश्वसूकरोष्ट्राणां ब्रह्महा योनिमृच्छति। ...ब्रह्महा क्षयरोगी स्यात्सुरापः श्यावदन्तकः॥

fices (intended to secure other worldly rewards) and *prāyaścittas* (that yield consequences in this world as well as in the next) and the last clause distinguishes śāntis from rites of black magic (for destroying one's enemies or securing a married woman's love &c.) which is sinful.

The number of śāntis is legion. They are prescribed for conjuring away the effects of rare natural phenomena such as eclipses, earth-quakes, rainfall (of peculiar kinds, of blood &c.) hurricanes, fall of meteors, comets, halos, Fata Morgana; for protection against the evil effects of the positions and movements of planets and stars for the world and for individuals; for strange births among human beings and animals; for the good of horses and elephants; for certain untoward happenings about Indra's banner and about images of gods falling or weeping, the cries of birds and beasts, the fall of lizards and the like on a person's limbs and on certain stated periods or on solemn occasions.

All rites of Śānti, Pauṣtika rites and the Mahādānas were to be performed in ordinary fire, since there is no authority to prove that they are to be performed in śrauta fires or in smārta fire. Manu 3. 67 and Yāj. I. 97 refer only to ceremonies laid down in the Gṛhyasūtras. On Yāj. I. 285-86 the Mitākṣarā prescribes ordinary fire for offerings in Vināyaka-śānti. Vide also Śāntimayūkha p. 4.

Both Manu [1217] and the Viṣṇudharmasūtra prescribe that homas in which the Sun is the deity worshipped and Śāntihomas should be performed by a householder on the *parvans* (i. e. on Paurṇamāsī and Amāvāsyā). These were śāntis at fixed periods. Similarly, when a person, male or female, of any caste completed sixty years, there was the possibility that he may die soon, or that he may lose his mother or father or his wife or sons or that various diseases may affect him; for removing this danger a śānti is prescribed (and is often performed even now) in order that he may enjoy a long life, be free from all calamities and for his complete prosperity. This is called *Ṣaṣṭyabdapūrti* (completion of sixty years) or Ugrarathaśānti.[1217a]

1217. सावित्राञ् शान्तिहोमांश्च कुर्यात्पर्वसु नित्यशः। मनु IV. 150; पर्वसु शान्तिहोमं कुर्यात्। वि. ध. सू. 71. 86.

1217a. Vide Mitra's Notices vol. IX No. 3234 for a ms. of Ugrarathaśānti and F. W. Thomas Presentation volume pp. 43-45 for 'ṣaṣṭyabdapūrti.'

One of the oldest available descriptions of the Ugrarathaśānti is found in the Baudhāyanagṛhyaśeṣa-sūtra (V. 8.). It is brief and the main items in it are set out here. It should be performed in the month of one's birth and on the nakṣatra of birth. A *vedi* as large as a bull's hide should be made, a jar full of water should be placed thereon and on the jar an image of Mṛtyu (Death) manufactured with two *niṣkas* (i. e. gold probably weighing as much) should be placed in the south-east corner; worship should be offered to the image and a *japa* of each of the mantras 'apaitu mṛtyuḥ' ('may Death go away', Tai. Br. III. 7. 14. 4), 'param Mṛtyo' (O Death! follow the path beyond &c.', Tai. Br. II. 7. 14. 5 and Ṛg. X. 18. 1), 'mā nas-toke' (O Rudra! do not injure our progeny' &c., Tai. S. III. 4. 11. 2 and Ṛg. I. 114. 8), and 'Tryambakam' ('we offer sacrifice to Rudra', Tai. S. I. 8. 6. 2 and Ṛg. VII. 59. 12) be made 108 times; he offers oblations of cooked food with the *puronuvākyā* (invitatory prayer) 'mā no mahāntam' (O Rudra! do not destroy our grown up ones &c.', Tai. S. IV. 5. 10. 2 and Ṛg. I. 114. 7) and the *Yājyā* (offering prayer) 'Mā nas-toke' (Tai. S. III. 4. 11. 2 and Ṛg. I 114. 8). Then he makes subsidiary offerings of ghee with each verse of the Ghṛtasūkta.[1218] Then he sprinkles himself with water from the jar to the accompaniment of mantras from the Mṛtyusūkta, from the Āyuṣyasūkta and with Paurāṇika mantras, honours the officiating priest, gives dakṣiṇā to the brāhmaṇas and a dinner.

There is a Ms. (of only three folios in D. C. No. 609 of the year 1882–83, now in the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute at Poona) which deals with this śānti attributed to Śaunaka and is called Ugrarathaśānti at the end. The śānti is to be performed on the day or nakṣatra of one's birth. On that day the person of 60 years should take an auspicious bath, perform his daily religious duties, should invite brāhmaṇas and choose one to officiate who is learned in the Vedas and Vedāṅgas and is well conducted. First Gaṇeśa worship should be performed, then

---

1218 It is difficult to say what hymn is intended here by the word 'ghṛtasūktena'. It is probably Ṛg. VI. 70. 1–6 (ghṛtavatī bhuvanānām &c.). The Mṛtyusūkta is probably the same as Ṛg. X. 18. The Āyuṣya hymn is a *Khila* hymn after Ṛg. X. 128 and begins 'āyuṣyam varcasyam rāyaspoṣam audbhidam.' The Karmapradīpa of Gobhila (I. 17) prescribes that Āyuṣya hymns should be recited in śrāddha for śānti. The Smṛticandrikā (śrāddha p. 503) quotes Gobhila I. 17 and explains that they are hymns like the one beginning 'ā no bhadrāḥ' Ṛg. I. 89. 1.

puṇyāhavācana, worship of Mother goddesses, then nāndīśrāddha. He should bring together *sarvauṣadhis*,[1219] twigs and leaves of five trees, five jewels, *pañcagavya*, and pañcāmṛta; then worship of nine planets should be performed; an image of Mārkaṇḍeya was to be made from one *pala* or ½ pala or ¼ pala and the image was placed in a jar full of water surrounded by two garments; he should offer the 16 *upacāras* and offer to Mārkaṇḍeya 1008, or 108 or 28 or eight offerings of fuel sticks, boiled rice, ghee, dūrvā, superior dishes with the mantra (quoted below[1220]). Then he should make a *homa* in honour of Mṛtyuñjaya (Śiva) with oblations of dūrvā grass and sesame 10000, or 5000, or 3000 or one thousand in number and then he should sacrifice separately to the secondary objects of worship, viz. Aśvatthāman, Bali, Vyāsa, Hanumat, Bibhīṣaṇa, Kṛpa and Paraśurāma. Then he should perform a homa with fried grams according to his ability and should recite Śrīsūkta,[1221] Rudra, the Āyuṣya-mantras, the Puruṣasūkta and specially the complete recitation of the Veda; he should finish the *homa* and offer pūrṇāhuti; then water from the jar should be sprinkled over the *yajamāna* (i. e. person who has completed 60 years), his wife and his near relatives; then there should be a *japa* of śānti hymn, the Puruṣasūkta, the mantra Ṛg. X. 18. 1, the Āyusya hymn, Pāvamāna hymn (hymn to Soma from Ṛg. IX.), the six verses of Śivasaṅkalpa (Vāj. S. 32. 1-6), and Mahāśānti. Then the jar should be donated and the garments rendered wet by the *abhiṣeka* and a decked cow with calf should be donated to the officiating priest; ten *dānas* [1222] to brāhmaṇas and gold weighing one hundred *mānas*; he should perform ājyāvekṣaṇa and offer '*bali*' (to all beings, crows &c.); he should then receive the blessings of the brāhmaṇas and put on a new garment; then he should have *nīrājana* performed and bow to deities and feed a thousand or a hundred brāhmaṇas and then himself partake of food along with his relatives. Whoever performs this śānti, according to the rules prescribed for grahaśānti, would certainly

---

1219. For सर्वौषधि, vide p. 444 above, for five twigs vide pp. 336, 339 above undr पञ्चभङ्गदल and पल्लव, for five jewels p. 337.

1220. मार्कण्डेय महाभाग सप्तकल्पान्तजीवन। आयुरारोग्यमैश्वर्यं देहि मे मुनिपुङ्गव॥

1221. श्रीसूक्त begins हिरण्यवर्णां हरिणीम्; रुद्र is the eleven anuvākas of तै. सं. IV. 5. 1-11, beginning with नमस्ते रुद्र मन्यव; आयुष्यमन्त्रs are those like ऋ. II. 38. 5, VII. 90. 6 or आथर्वणपरिशिष्ट XXXII. 9.

1222. For the ten dānas vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 869 and above p. 334 for नीराजन.

live for a hundred years, all misfortunes will vanish and all prosperity will be his. The *prayoga* (procedure of this śānti) is given below[1223] since it is often performed even now.

It is difficult to say why this śānti was called Ugraratha. Another śānti on the completion of 70 years or on the 7th night of the 7th month of the 77th year is called Bhaimarathī-śānti, according to the Śabdakalpadruma, which quotes some verses from *Vaidyaka* without stating what work is meant.[1223a] Baud. gṛhyaśeṣasūtra I. 24 prescribes a śānti for one who has lived up to 100 years or one who has seen 1000 amāvāsyās.

The general rule about the time for śāntis is that no definite time can be fixed for them, since śānti rites are performed with the object of removing the evil consequences of men's lapses suggested by such indications (or omens) as dreams, the evil aspects of planets and the like i. e. they are to be performed as and when omens or portents occur or are observed and one should not wait for such times as the northward passage of the Sun, bright fortnight and that one may perform śāntis even in the southward passage of the Sun or even in an intercalary

---

1223. अथ प्रयोगः। देशकालौ संकीर्त्य अमुकगोत्रोत्पन्नस्यामुकशर्मणो मम आयुष्याभिवृद्ध्यर्थं श्रीमार्कण्डेयादिदेवताप्रीत्यर्थं सग्रहमखामुग्ररथशान्तिं करिष्ये। तदङ्गगणेशपूजामातृपूजानान्दीश्राद्ध-आचार्यादिवरणं च करिष्ये-इति सङ्कल्प्य तानि कृत्वा वृताचार्यः शरीरशुद्ध्यर्थं देवयजनं रक्षस्वेत्यन्तमुक्त्वा ग्रहस्थापनं कृत्वा मार्कण्डेयाय नम इति मन्त्रेण पीठोपरि कलशे मार्कण्डेयमावाह्य परिवारदेवतावाहनं कुर्यात्। अश्वत्थाम्ने नमः अश्वत्थामानमावाहयामि। एवमुत्तरत्र बलये नमः बलिमावाहयामि. व्यासाय॰, हनुमते॰, विभीषणाय॰. कृपाय॰, परशुरामाय॰ एता आवाह्य काण्डानुसमयेन पदार्थानुसमयेन वा सम्पूज्याग्निप्रतिष्ठापनादि चक्षुषी आज्येनेत्यन्तं, तत्र प्रधानं आदित्यादीन् यथालाभं समिदादिद्रव्यैः मार्कण्डेयं समिदाज्यचरुदूर्वापायसद्रव्यैः प्रत्येकमष्टोत्तरसहस्राष्टोत्तरशताष्टाविंशतिरन्यतमसंख्याभिर्वा आहुतिभिः, मृत्युञ्जयं दूर्वाद्रव्येणायुतसंख्यया पञ्चसहस्रसंख्यया त्रिसहस्रसंख्यया सहस्रसंख्यया वा, पुनर्मृत्युञ्जयं तिलद्रव्येण पूर्वोक्तसंख्यया। अश्वत्थामादीन् लाजद्रव्येणाष्टोत्तरादिसंख्यया यक्ष्ये शेषेणेत्यादिप्रधानहोमाङ्गं कृत्वा श्रीसूक्तं रुद्राध्यायं आयुष्यसूक्तं पुरुषसूक्तं यथाशक्ति वेदपारायणं च कृत्वा बलिदानं पूर्णाहुतिं च कृत्वा होमशेषं समाप्य, अभिषेकं यजमानस्य सपत्नीकस्य बन्धुवर्गसमन्वितस्य कृत्वा शान्तिसूक्तं पुरुषसूक्तं परं मृत्योनुपरेहीति आयुष्यसूक्तं पावमानं शिवसङ्कल्पं महाशान्तिं च जप्त्वा अभिषेककालीनवस्त्रमाचार्याय दत्त्वा सालङ्कारां गां च दत्त्वा दशदानानि विप्रेभ्यो दत्त्वा सुवर्णदानं च कृत्वा आज्यावलोकनं तिलदानं ब्राह्मणभोजनसङ्कल्पं आशीर्ग्रहणं देवताभिवादनं च कृत्वा कर्मेश्वरार्पणं कृत्वा बन्धुजनैः सह भुञ्जीतेति शौनकोक्ता उग्ररथशान्तिः। देशकाल॰ अमुकगोत्रोत्पन्नस्य अमुकशर्मणः मम जन्मतः सञ्जातषष्ट्यब्दकालनिमित्तदुःस्वप्नदन्तरोगदृष्टिमान्द्यच्छायाविकृतिध्रुवादिनक्षत्रदर्शनभूतप्रेतपिशाचादि-नानाविधशारीरक्लेशापमृत्युमहोग्रपीडाराजभयादि-सकलारिष्टनिरसनपूर्वकदीर्घायुरारोग्यैश्वर्यसम्पत्प्राप्त्यादिसदभीष्टसिद्धिद्वारा श्रीमार्कण्डेयादिदेवताप्रीत्यर्थं सग्रहमखामुग्ररथशान्तिं करिष्ये। श्रीगजाननार्पणमस्तु।

1223 a. सप्तसप्ततिवर्षाणां सप्तमे मासि सप्तमी। रात्रिर्भीमरथी नाम नराणामतिदुस्तरा॥ तामतीत्य नरो योऽसौ दिनानि यानि जीवति। क्रतुभिस्तानि तुल्यानि सुवर्णशतदक्षिणैः ...इति वैद्यकम्.

month.[1224] If there is no hurry, then a śānti was to be performed on an auspicious week-day, an auspicious tithi and on certain nakṣatras, viz. the three Uttarās, Rohiṇī, Śravaṇa, Dhaniṣṭhā, Śatatārakā, Punarvasu, Svātī, Maghā, Aśvinī, Hasta, Puṣya, Anurādhā and Revatī.[1225] As regards the Lakṣahoma the Matsya (93. 86) prescribes that it should be performed after securing favourable planets and *Tārās* (stars). Vide also p. 290 above about Koṭihoma prescribed by the Atharva-pariśiṣṭa (XXXI pp. 187–191). The Matsya prescribes that a Koṭihoma should be begun in Caitra or Kārtika (239. 20–21); the invisibility of Jupiter and Venus and similar matters need not be considered when a śānti has to be performed immediately on the occurrence of an omen (or portent) or when the śānti is meant for alleviating the disease from which a person may be suffering.

As against several *adbhutas* and *utpātas*, texts prescribe a rite called Mahāśānti. The Śānkhāyana Gṛ. (V. 11) speaks of a Mahāśānti, when an ant-hill grows in one's house, which has been referred to above on p. 730 note 1162. The details of a Mahāśānti differ in different texts and on different occasions. The Adbhuta-sāgara provides that where no specific details about śāntis against certain utpātas like a fall of meteors are prescribed one should have recourse to a sānti consisting in homa offerings to the accompaniment of one million repetitions of the sacred Gāyatrī verse ('tat-savitur' &c. Ṛg. III. 62. 10) or to the Mahāśānti called Abhayā according to the nature (grave or light) of the omen or portent.[1226] In the Marāṭhi commentary on the

---

1224. अत एव दक्षः। नैमित्तिकानि काम्यानि निपतन्ति यथा यथा। तथा तथैव कार्याणि न कालस्तु विधीयते॥ नैमित्तिकानि काम्यानीति समानाधिकरणम्। निमित्ताद् ग्रहदौःस्थ्यदुःस्वप्नादेः कर्तव्यत्वेन प्रतीतानि नैमित्तिकानि निमित्तसूचितदोषशान्तिकामनया क्रियमाणानि तान्येव काम्यानि। न कालस्तु विधीयते इति उदगयनशुक्लपक्षदिनपूर्वभागादिरूपः कालो नानुरुध्यते। तेन एतद्व्यतिरिक्ते दक्षिणायनादौ निन्दिते मलिम्लुचादौ च शान्तिकं कर्तव्यमिति शान्तिकपौष्टिके कल्पतरुः। मलमासतत्त्व p. 796 (vol. I). This whole passage of the कृत्यकल्प॰ (on शान्तिकपौष्टिक) occurs on folio 4a and b in the Baroda ms. of it.

1225. त्र्युत्तरा-रोहिणी-श्रवण-धनिष्ठा-शततारका-पुनर्वसु-स्वातीमघाश्विनी-हस्तपुष्यानुराधारेवतीनक्षत्रेषु गुरुशुक्रास्तमलमासरहितेषु शुभवारतिथ्यादौ शान्तिः कार्या। निमित्तानव्यवहितनैमित्तिके रोगशान्तौ च अस्तादिविचारणा नास्ति। धर्मसिन्धु p. 176.

1226. अत्रानुक्तविशेषशान्तिषूल्कापातेषु सावित्रीमन्त्रकदशलक्षहोमादिका शान्तिरभयाख्या वा महाशान्तिरौत्पातिकफलगुरुलाघवमवगम्य कर्तव्या। अ. सा. p. 341; the शान्तिरत्न of कमलाकर (folios 208–211 a) prescribes a mahāśānti put in the Bhaviṣyapurāṇa in the name of Kṛṣṇa to be performed at the coronation of a king or before starting on an invasion, or when a person has a bad dream or the planets are unfavourable, or when there is an earthquake &c. Vide also शान्तिमयूख pp. 106–108 for महाशान्ति.

Nirṇayasindhu (p. 233) about the question of a rite on the first appearance of a woman's monthly illness a *japa* of Mahāśānti is prescribed after an elaborate homa and worship and the Mahāśānti is explained as consisting of the recitation of Ṛg. I. 89. 1–10 (beginning with 'ā no bhadrā'), Ṛg. V. 51. 11–15 (beginning with 'svasti no mimītām &c.') and Ṛg. VII. 35. 1–15 (beginning with 'śan-na Indrāgnī'). The Bhaviṣyottara (143. 2–46) describes a Mahāśānti to be performed at a king's coronation, on his marching out on an invasion, when one has bad dreams or inauspicious omens (*nimittas*), when the planets are unfavourable or when there is lightning and the fall of meteors, when a Ketu appears, in a hurricane, earthquake, birth on a Mūla nakṣatra or Gaṇḍānta, on birth of twins, when parasols and banners fall on the ground, when a crow, owl or pigeon enters a house, when malefic planets are retrograde (especially in the naksatra or rāśi of birth), when Jupiter, Saturn, Mars and the Sun are in the 1st, 4th, 8th or 12th houses (in a person's horoscope), when there is *graha-yuddha*; when garments, weapons, horses and cows, or jewels and hair are lost, or when rainbow is seen at night in front, when the beam on a house pillar is smashed, when a she—mule conceives, on eclipses of the Sun and the Moon—on these a Mahāśānti is commended. The procedure is briefly as follows: Five learned and well-conducted brāhmaṇas should officiate in a *maṇḍapa* ten or twelve cubits on each side, in the midst of which there should be a raised platform four cubits on each side and in the south-east corner of that platform there should be a *kuṇḍa* (receptacle for fire). Five jars should be placed, four in the four intermediate quarters (south-east &c.) and the fifth in the middle of the platform and numerous things such as twigs and leaves of some plants, jewels, sandalwood, mustard grains, *śamī* and *dūrvā*, *kuśas* and grains of rice should be collected thereon; Vedic mantras such as 'āśuḥ śiśāno' (Ṛg. X. 103. 1) on north-west, 'Īśā vāsya' (Vāj. S. 40. 1) on north-east, were to be recited over the jars, worship is to be offered with *gandha*, flowers, lamps, fruits like cocoanut to the jars and fire should be placed in the *kuṇḍa* with 'agnim dūtam' (Ṛg. I. 12. 1), seat (*āsana*) should be offerred with the mantra 'hiraṇya-garbhaḥ' (Ṛg. X. 121. 1), then *pāyasa* should be cooked to the accompaniment of Puruṣa-sūkta (Ṛg. X. 90), eighteen fuel sticks of śamī and seven palāśa ones should be cast into Agni, seven *āhutis* of clarified ghee and seven of rice boiled in milk should be offered to Agni with a mantra 'Jātavedase' (Ṛg. I. 99. 1), four more with the hymn

'tarat sa mandi' (Rg. IX. 58), seven with 'yamāya' (Rg. X. 14 13) and again seven with 'idam Viṣṇur' (Rg. I. 22. 17) and 27 āhutis to the 27 nakṣatras, then performance of 'sviṣṭakṛt' homa, grahahoma with sesame covered with ghee, then prāyaścitta; thus ends the homa; then the *yajamāna* sitting on a throne of kāśmarya wood should have sprinkled over him to the accompaniment of drum-beating and conch-blowing water from the five jars with five different mantras, then an offering to all the directions (*digbali*) with the mantra 'salutation to all bhūtas'. After the bath, brāhmaṇas recite a śānti over him after letting fall a stream of śānti water all round; then *puṇyāhavācana* and then close of the śānti rite, then gifts of land, gold, beds, seats according to the person's ability to brāhmaṇas; he should treat to a sumptuous meal the poor and helpless and men learned in the Veda. On doing this he secures long life, quick victory over enemies, even difficult undertakings succeed.

The huge work Adbhutasāgara is mostly concerned with rare natural phenomena such as halo, rainbows, hurricanes, glowing horizon (*digdāha*), meteors, comets, earthquakes, rain without clouds, red rain, shower of fish, Fata Morgama &c.

A few words must be said about some striking ones out of these. First comes earthquake. The Bṛ. S. (32. 1-2) puts forth four theories of his predecessors about the cause of an earthquake viz. it was caused by huge animals dwelling inside the seas (view of Kāśyapa) or according to others (Garga) it was caused by the heavy breaths emitted by the elephants of the quarters when tired by carrying the weight of the earth; others (like Vasiṣṭha) said that earthquake noise is caused by the winds striking against each other (in the sky) and falling on the earth; other ācāryas (like Vṛddhagarga) held that an earthquake was caused by *adṛṣṭa* (i. e. by the sins of the people on the earth[1227]). In verses 3-7 of Bṛ. S. (chap. 32) Varāha narrates the myth that mountains had in the dim past wings and the earth being much shaken by their movements approached Pitāmaha (Brahmā) and Brahmā seeing her sad plight asked Indra to discharge his thunderbolt for clipping the wings of mountains and for removing the anger (or sorrow) of the earth; Indra did so, but he told the earth that Vāyu, Agni, Indra (himself) and

1227. The ब्रह्मपुराण sets out a novel cause of earthquake 'यदा विजृम्भतेऽनन्तो मदाघूर्णितलोचनः । तदा चलति भूरेषा साद्रितोयाधिकानना ॥ 21. 23-24; अ. सा. p. 383 quotes this verse from विष्णुपुराण with slight variations.

Varuṇa would (each) at different parts of the day and night make the earth shake in order to indicate (to mortals) the fruits of their good and bad deeds. In Bṛ. S. 32. 8–22 Varāha describes the spheres and premonitory signs of Vāyu, Agni, Indra and Varuṇa with the nakṣatras and the countries they affect. The Adbhutasāgara (pp. 383–409) quotes most of the verses of Varāha and prescribes śāntis for each of the four deities that are deemed to be connected with earthquakes. The Adbhutasāgara refers to earthquakes that happened when angry Arjuna got no sleep after he made a vow that he would kill Jayadratha before the next day's sunset (Droṇaparva 77. 4) and when Duryodhana challenged Bhīma for a mace fight (Śalyaparva 56. 10 and 58. 49).

It should not be a matter for surprise that ancient and medieval Indians regarded earthquakes as punishments sent by God for the sins of men. The English poet Cowper gives vent to this belief in his poem 'Timepeace'.[1228] The most distinguished Indian of modern times viz. Mahātmā Gāndhi, regarded the earthquake in Bihar that occurred on January 15, 1934, and affected an area of about 30000 square miles and a population of about 15 millions and that killed thousands and made millions homeless, as God's punishment for the prevalence of the evil system of untouchability in Hindu[1229] society. To the natural and usual query why God should punish a small country or a small community with frightful earthquakes and overwhelming waves when other countries and millions of other people are guilty of the same misdeeds, Cowper endeavours to give a reply

1228. What then: Were they the wicked above all,
And we the righteous, whose fast-anchored isle
Moved not, while theirs was rocked like a light skiff,
The sport of every wave. No! none are clear,
And none than we more guilty. But where all
Stand chargeable with guilt, and to the shafts
Of wrath obnoxious, God may choose his mark;
May punish, if he please, the less, to warn
The more malignant.

'Timepiece' lines 150–158.

1229. Vide the eight volume life of Mahātmā Gāndhi by D. G. Tendulkar, vol. 3 pp. 304–308 and vol. 4 pp. 41–42. The characteristic sentences are 'A man of prayer regards what are known as physical calamities as divine chastisement alike for individuals and nations'; 'A man like me cannot but believe that this earthquake is a divine chastisement sent by God for our sins' (vol. 3 p. 303); 'I share the belief with the whole world, civilized and uncivilized, that calamities such as the Bihar one come to mankind as chastisement for their sins' (*ibid.*, p. 305).

in the lines quoted above. It appears that, in spite of the beliefs now discredited, Vṛddha Garga and Varāha appear to have also believed that comets had orbits like planets and were visible in the firmament at certain long intervals of time.

The rules to be observed about eclipses have already been stated above (pp. 243–250). Though the real causes of lunar and solar eclipses were known long before the time of Varāhamihira as shown above (p. 242, n 622) this knowledge was not accepted by the masses for centuries and even now many people in India still entertain the old beliefs about eclipses.[1230] Varāha criticises ancient writers like Vṛddha Garga and Parāśara who prophesied an eclipse when five planets including Mercury came together or there were such *nimittas* as halo of the Sun, dim rays [1231] (Br. S. V. 16–17). Here the Śānti for it will be briefly described. One view was that an eclipse was auspicious [1232] to a person, if the eclipse occurs when the Sun or the Moon is in the 3rd, 6th, 10th or 11th rāśi (zodiacal sign) from the rāśi of the birth of a person, it is neither auspicious nor inauspicious when any one of the two is in 2nd, 5th, 7th or 9th rāśi from that of birth and it is inauspicious when the eclipsed sun or moon is in the 1st, 4th, 8th and 12th rāśi from the rāśi of birth. The view of Garga was that if an eclipse occurs when the sun or moon is in the rāśi of the birth of a person or if any of them is in the 1st, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th or 12th rāśi from that of birth or if any of them occupies the nakṣatra of the birth of a person or the 9th nakṣatra from that of birth, it leads to calamities for that person. If an eclipse occurred when the Sun or Moon occupied the nakṣatra of the day of the coronation of the king, that portends the ruin of the kingdom, the loss of friends and

---

1230. Vide Bertrand Russell in 'Impact of science on society' p. 11 for remarks on eclipses and for the use even Milton makes of popular beliefs about them.

1231. न कथंचिदपि निमित्तैर्ग्रहणं विज्ञायते निमित्तानि । अन्यस्मिन्नपि काले भवन्त्यथोत्पातरूपाणि ॥ पञ्चग्रहसंयोगान्न किल ग्रहणस्य सम्भवो भवति । तैले च जलेऽष्टम्यां न विचिन्त्यमिदं विपश्चिद्भिः ॥ बृहत्संहिता V. 16–17. Vide उत्पल's quotations on these from पराशर and वृद्धगर्ग.

1232. जन्मसप्ताष्टरिःफाङ्कदशमस्थे निशाकरे (v. l. दिवाकरे)। दृष्टोरिष्टप्रदो राहुर्जन्मर्क्षे निधनेऽपि च । मदनरत्ने गर्गः q. by नि. सि. p. 68 which explains: रिःफं द्वादशं, अङ्का नव, निधनं सप्तमतारा; पुराणान्तरे । सूर्यस्य संक्रमो वापि ग्रहणं चन्द्रसूर्ययोः । यस्य त्रिजन्मनक्षत्रे तस्य रोगोऽथवा मृतिः । तस्य दानं च होमं च देवार्चनजपौ तथा । उपरागाभिषेकं च कुर्याच्छान्तिर्भविष्यति । स्वर्णेन वाथ पिष्टेन कृत्वा सर्पस्य चाकृतिम् । ब्राह्मणाय दद्यात्तस्य न रोगादिश्च तत्कृतः । जन्मनक्षत्रं तत्पूर्वोत्तरे च त्रिजन्मनक्षत्रमुच्यते, जन्मदशमैकोनविंशतितारा इति केचित् । नि. सि. p. 68.

the death of the king.[1233] Atri said that when the eclipse of the Sun or Moon occurs in the nakṣatra of a person's birth, disease, journeys and death are portended, and great danger for the king (whose nakṣatra is so affected). The averting of evil would follow if the man makes gifts and is engaged (that day) in worship of gods and *japa*.[1234] Several modes of śānti are prescribed, particularly for him whose rāśi or nakṣatra of birth or one of three nakṣatras (viz. that of birth, the one preceding and the one following the nakṣatra of birth) is occupied by the eclipsed Sun or Moon. One way is to make the figure of a serpent (that represents the demon Rāhu) with gold or flour and to donate it to a brāhmaṇa. Another was to make a serpent out of gold weighing a *pala* (i.e. 320 *guñjas*) or one half, one fourth or one eighth *pala* and to fix a jewel on its hood and place the serpent figure in a vessel of copper, bronze or cast iron full of ghee and donate it with a dakṣiṇā and also donate a silver disc of the moon and a golden serpent when it is a lunar eclipse and a golden disc of the Sun and a golden serpent when it is a solar eclipse. Further gifts of a horse, chariot, cows, land, sesame, ghee and gold also are recommended. The mantra accompanying the gifts addressed to Rāhu is quoted below.[1235] The Nirṇayasindhu also sets out a far more elaborate śānti from the Matsyapurāṇa, which is passed over for reasons of space.

The fall of meteors (*ulkā*) required a śānti. There were several beliefs about them. Garga held that they were missiles discharged by the Lokapālas [1236] who send down flaming meteors as missiles for indicating (coming) auspicious or calamitous events. Another view was that they were really souls that fell

---

1233. यस्य राज्यस्य नक्षत्रे स्वर्भानुरुपरज्यते। राज्यभङ्गं सुहृन्नाशं मरणं चात्र निर्दिशेत्। भार्गव q. by अ. सा. (q. in नि. सि. p. 68).

1234. आह चात्रिः। यस्य स्वजन्मनक्षत्रे ग्रस्येते शशिभास्करौ। व्याधिं प्रवासं मृत्युं च राज्ञश्चैव महद्भयम्॥ तस्माद्दानं च दातव्यं देवार्चनजपस्तथा। कुर्यात्तस्मिन्दिने शुक्लस्तस्य शान्तिर्भविष्यति॥ q. by कालविवेक p. 543.

1235. The दानमन्त्र is: तमोमय महाभीम सोमसूर्यविमर्दन। हेमताराप्रदानेन मम शान्तिप्रदो भव॥ विधुन्तुद नमस्तुभ्यं सिंहिकानन्दनाच्युत। दानेनानेन नागस्य रक्ष मां वेधजाद्भयात्॥ नि. सि. p. 68, धर्मसिन्धु p. 35. Vide ब्रह्मपुराण chap. 106 and Matsya 251 for the story of Rāhu at the time of the churning of the ocean and I. A. vol. 16 p. 288 (for the same) and I. A. vol. 21 p. 123 about the customs connected with eclipses.

1236. Lokapālas are guardians of the world or of the four cardinal directions and four intermediate ones from the east onwards in order viz. Indra, Agni, Yama, Sūrya, Varuṇa, Vāyu, Kubera, Soma. Some substitute Nirṛti for Sūrya. Vide Manu V. 96.

down to the earth (for fresh births) after enjoying in heaven the favourable results of their actions.[1237] Meteors are often referred to in the epics as falling on serious occasions e. g. the Śalya-parva mentions [1238] the fall of a flaming meteor accompanied by a great noise and whirlwind when Duryodhana fell in the macefight with Bhīma. In Droṇaparva a flaming meteor is referred to as indicative of the coming death of the great ācārya and warrior Droṇa. The Adbhutasāgara (pp. 342–344) quotes a long passage (of 23½ verses) from Ātharvaṇādbhuta about the fall of meteors [1239] by day. It is said therein that such a fall of meteors by day portends the destruction of the country and its king and therefore a Mahāśānti called Amṛtā should be performed. There is an Ātharvaṇa-pariśiṣṭa LVIII b on *ulkā*, but the Adbhutasāgara verses do not appear to have been extracted from that.

Certain natural phenomena, though they may be called utpātas if they occur at certain times, are not to be regarded as such at certain other times. In Bṛ. S. 45. 82 Varāha says that certain occurrences natural to certain seasons do not lead to any unfavourable consequences; one should know them from the verses composed by Ṛṣiputra that are concise. Then he proceeds: in Madhu and Mādhava (Caitra and Vaiśākha) the following occurrences lead to good viz. lightning, meteors, earthquake, glowing twilight, noisy whirl-winds, halo (of Sun and Moon), dust in the sky, vapour (in forest), red sunrise and sunset; possibility of getting from trees food, rasas (sweet &c.), oily substances, numerous flowers and fruits; and amorous activities among cows and birds. The following are beneficial (auspicious) in summer (Jyeṣṭha and Āṣāḍha) viz. sky rendered dusky by the fall of stars and meteors, or in which the appearance of the Sun and the Moon is dark-brown, which is full of fiery glow without a flaring fire, loud noises, vapour, dust and

---

1237. उल्कास्वरूपमाह गर्गः। अम्भाणि विसृजन्त्येते शुभाशुभनिवेदकाः। लोकपाला महात्मानो लोकानां ज्वलितानि तु॥ उत्पल on बृहत्सं. 33. 1 and अ. सा. p. 321: दिवि शुक्रशुभफलानां पततां रूपाणि यानि तान्युल्काः। बृहत्सं. 33. 1.

1238. तस्मिन्निपतिते वीरे पत्यौ सर्वमहीक्षिताम्। महास्वना पुनर्दीप्ता सनिर्घाता भयङ्करी॥ पपात चोल्का महती पतिते पृथिवीपतौ। शल्यपर्व 58. 50–51; अपतद्दीप्यमाना च सनिर्घाता सकम्पना। उल्का ज्वलन्ती संग्रामे पुच्छेनावृत्य सर्वशः॥ द्रोणपर्व 7.38–39; मत्स्य 163. 43 has: अपतन्गगनादुल्का विद्युद्रूपा महास्वनाः। (among the numerous portents in the fight of हिरण्यकशिपु with नृसिंह).

1239. अथर्वणाद्भुते। दिवा पतति चोल्का सा हन्त्यादेशं सभूपतिम्। महाशान्तिं तत्र कुर्यादमृतां विश्वभेषजीम्॥ अ. सा. p. 342,

winds, in which evenings are like red lotus and which look like a stormy sea, and when rivers are dried up. In the rains (Śrāvaṇa and Bhādrapada) the following portend no danger viz. rainbow, halo (of Sun and Moon), lightning, dried trees giving out fresh sprouts, the earth quaking or rolling or showing other than its usual appearance, noises in the earth or gaps therein, or when lakes increase in expanse of water or rivers rise up (in floods), or when wells are full or when houses on hills roll down. In Śarad (Āśvina and Kārtika) the following are not of evil import viz. the sight of divine damsels, ghosts, gandharvas, air conveyances and other *adbhutas;* the planets, nakṣatras and other stars becoming visible by day in the sky; noises of song and music in forests and on mountain peaks; abundance of crops and reduction of waters. In Hemanta (Mārgaśīrṣa and Pauṣa) the following are auspicious viz. the presence of cool winds and frost, loud cries of birds and beasts, the sight of rakṣas (evil spirits), *Yakṣas* and other (usually invisible) beings, non-human voices, directions darkened by vapour together with the sky, forests and mountains, the appearance of the rise and setting of the Sun at a higher point than usual. The following appearances are auspicious in Śiśira (Māgha and Phālguna) viz. the fall of snow, portentous winds, sight of terrible beings and *adbhutas*, sky resembling dark collyrium and rendered reddish-yellow by the fall of meteors and stars, the birth of various strange issue from women, cows, sheep, mares, beasts, and birds, strange appearances of leaves, sprouts and creepers. These when seen in the proper seasons are auspicious in those respective seasons, but when seen at other than the proper seasons they are very terrible portents. Two verses [1240]

1240. ये च न दोषाञ्जनयन्त्युत्पातास्तानृतुस्वभावकृतान्। ऋषिपुत्रकृतैः श्लोकैर्विद्यादेतैः समासोक्तैः ॥ वज्राशनिमहीकम्पसन्ध्यानिर्घातनिःस्वनाः। परिवेषरजोधूमरक्तार्कास्तमनोदयाः ॥ द्रुमेभ्योऽन्नरसस्नेहबहुपुष्पफलोद्गमाः। गोपक्षिमदवृद्धिश्च शिवाय मधुमाधवे ॥ ...ऋतुस्वभावजा ह्येते दृष्टाः स्वर्तौ शुभप्रदाः। ऋतोरन्यत्र चोत्पाता दृष्टास्ते चातिदारुणाः ॥ बृहत्सं. 45. 82–84 and 95. The occurrence of these twelve verses (45. 83–94) both in Bṛ. S. and Viṣṇudharmottara raises the important question of the chronological relation of the two works. Varāhamihira expressly tells us that he took the twelve verses (45. 83–94) from Ṛṣiputra or shortened them. Therefore, he did not borrow from the Viṣṇudharmottara. Ṛṣiputra has been often quoted by Varāha in his works (vide above p. 593 and my paper in JBBRAS for 1948–49, vol 24–25, p. 15). The अ. सा. pp. 743–744 quotes the verses from बार्हस्पत्य, मत्स्यपुराण, विष्णुधर्मोत्तर and वराहसंहिता. The twelve verses occur in मत्स्य 229. 14–25, विष्णुधर्मोत्तर II, 134. 15–26. It must be stated that अ. सा.

(*Continued on next page*)

about Madhu-Mādhava and the last one (Br. S. 45. 84-85 and 95) are quoted below. The Br. S. further provides[1241] that whatever Gāthās (*prakrit* verses or simply verses) are recited by persons of distracted intellect, the utterances of children and what women speak out does not turn out to be wrong and that a person that understands utpātas, even though he may be devoid of mathematics (about planets), becomes famous and a favourite of the king, and by knowing the secret (or esoteric) words of the sage (Ṛṣiputra) which are stated (by me), a person sees the past, the present and the future.

Another very curious portent mentioned in the Mahābhārata, Kauśikasūtra[1242] (kaṇḍikā 105), Matsya (243), Viṣṇudharmottara, Bṛhatsaṁhitā and the Adbhutasāgara (pp. 425–436), Hemādri on Vrata vol. II (pp. 1078–79) and Madanaratna (on śānti, folio 54b) is the trembling, dancing, laughing and weeping of the images of gods. The Bhīṣmaparva[1243] refers to the images in the temples of the Kaurava king doing these acts. In the encounter of Hiraṇyakaśipu with the Man-lion form of

---

(Continued from last page)

agrees most closely with बृहत्सं., while in the मत्स्य the readings and the order of verses differ a good deal from the अ. सा. In my 'History of Sanskrit Poetics' (1951) pp. 64–70 I arrived for the Viṣṇudharmottara at a date between 500–600 A. D. on other evidence. In my opinion it is probable that the Viṣṇudharmottara borrows the verses from the Bṛhat-saṁhitā. If that he accepted, the Viṣṇudharmottara (at least the 2nd section of it) must be later than 600 A. D. It is possible to argue that the Purāṇa might have taken them from Ṛṣiputra. But the Purāṇa does not say so and in keeping with the assumed character of the Purāṇas as composed by the semi-divine Vyāsa at the beginning of Kaliyuga, the Purāṇas generally take care not to admit any borrowing from a merely human author. It should be noted that three of the verses quoted only from Yogayātrā of Varāha by अ. सा. p. 494 occur in विष्णुधर्मोत्तर II. 176. 9-11.

1241. उन्मत्तानां च या गाथाः शिशूनां यच्च भाषितम्। स्त्रियो यच्च प्रभाषन्ते तस्य नास्ति व्यतिक्रमः॥ ...उत्पातान् गणितविवर्जितोऽपि बुद्ध्वा विख्यातो भवति नरेन्द्रवल्लभश्च॥ एतत्तन्मुनिवचनं रहस्यमुक्तं यज्ज्ञात्वा भवति नरस्त्रिकालदर्शी॥ बृहत्सं. 45. 96 and 98.

1242. अथ यत्रैतद्देवतानि नृत्यन्ति च्योतन्ति हसन्ति गायन्ति वान्यानि वा रूपाणि कुर्वन्ति य आसुरा मनुष्या मा नो विदन्नमो देववधेभ्य इत्यभयैर्जुहुयात्। सा तत्र प्रायश्चित्तिः। कौशिकसूत्र 105. य आसुरा मनुष्या॰ is a मन्त्र in कौशिकसूत्र 104.2; मा नो विदन्॰ is अथर्व. I. 19. 1 and नमो देववधेभ्यः is अथर्व. VI. 13. 1. This prescribes a śānti viz. the offering of āhutis (of ghee) with these mantras called *Abhaya*.

1243. देवतायतनस्थाश्च कौरवेन्द्रस्य देवताः। कम्पन्ते च हसन्ते च नृत्यन्ति च रुदन्ति च॥ भीष्म 112. 11.

Viṣṇu the Matsyapurāṇa[1244] states 'the images of all gods shut and open their eyes, laugh, weep, scream, emit smoke, blaze, and these signs indicate that great danger impends.' In the Ātharvaṇa-pariśiṣṭa[1245] LXXII this matter is treated (in prose). It says 'there are portents called *divya* which occur in temples; they (images) laugh, sing, weep, shriek, perspire, cause smoke to issue out of them, they blaze, they tremble, open their eyes and shut them, blood oozes from them, they move to and fro.' These strange phenomena are said to forebode drought, danger from weapons, famine, epidemic in the country and destruction of the king and his ministers (or relatives). The śānti prescribed in the same Ātharvaṇa-pariśiṣṭa (4. 7) is as follows: one should boil *pāyasa* in the milk of 108 *kapilā* cows; if such cows are not available one should cook *pāyasa* with the milk of one hundred milch cows; he should put on the fire fuel-sticks with ends towards the east, should spread round the fire darbha grass and should offer oblations (of rice) in fire to the accompaniment of the mantras addressed to Rudra[1246] and called Raudra-gaṇa and also offer clarified butter (in fire). He should present white flowers, he should treat brāhmaṇas with boiled rice and should donate the same cows (the milk of which was used for cooking pāyasa) or donate the kingdom for a limited period for the satisfaction of a brāhmaṇa; he should give to the officiating priest a thousand cows and donate a good village.

Now śāntis on the birth of human beings should be referred to. There are several śāntis concerning the birth of a human being, such as a child's birth on Mūla, Āśleṣā, Jyeṣṭhā nakṣatras, on *gaṇḍānta*, on the 14th tithi of the dark fortnight or on

---

1244. उन्मीलन्ति निमीलन्ति हसन्ति च रुदन्ति च। विक्रोशन्ति च गम्भीरा धूमयन्ति ज्वलन्ति च। प्रतिमाः सर्वदेवानां वेदयन्ति (v. l. वेदयन्त्यो) महद्भयम्। मत्स्य 163. 45-46 = पद्म V. 42. 137-138.

1245. दिव्यानीत्याचक्षते देवगृहेषु। अथ हसन्ति गायन्ति रुदन्ति क्रोशन्ति प्रस्विद्यन्ति प्रधूमयन्ति प्रज्वलन्ति प्रकम्पन्त्युन्मीलयन्ति निमीलयन्ति लोहितं स्रवन्ति परिवर्तयन्ति। आथर्वणपरिशिष्ट LXXII (महाद्भुतानि) p. 525. It may be noticed that three of these actions occur in the भीष्मपर्व and six in मत्स्य.

1246. The रौद्रगण (the string of mantras addressed to Rudra in a śānti) specified in आथर्वणपरिशिष्ट XXXII. 17 is as follows: रुद्रजलाशभेषज. येऽस्याम्. प्राची दिक्, उदितस्त्रयो अक्रमन्, भवा शर्वौ मन्वे वाम्, ब्रह्म जज्ञानम्, अनाप्ता ये, सहस्रधार एव, ग्रीष्मो हेमन्तो, अनड्वद्भ्यस्त्वम्, मह्यमापो, वैश्वानरो, यमो मृत्युः, यां ते रुद्र. योऽग्नौ रुद्रो, भवाशर्वौ मृडतम्, भवाशर्वाविदं ब्रूमो, यस्ते सर्पो वृश्चिकः, तस्मै प्राच्या दिशो अन्तर्देशादिति रौद्रगणः। Vide note 1 on p. 146 in Bloomfield's edition of the कौशिकसूत्र 50. 13 for identification of these *pratīkas* from the Atharvaveda.

amāvāsyā, on Vyatīpāta-yoga or on Vaidhṛti or in an eclipse, or on the birth of twins, or when a girl is born to a person after three successive births of sons or a son is born after three successive births of girls. Some of these śāntis are performed even now. Therefore two of them which are still in vogue, though gradually becoming infrequent, are briefly described here. The consequences of birth on Mūla, Jyeṣṭhā and Āśleṣā are more or less similar. Here the *śānti for birth on Āśleṣā is briefly* set out.

The Āśleṣā nakṣatra has a mean measure of 60 ghaṭīs. It is to be divided into ten parts in order[1246a] viz. 5, 7, 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 6, 9 and 5; birth of a son in these parts indicates in order the loss of kingdom, death of father, death of mother, addiction to lovemaking, he has devotion to father, has strength, loses property, has proneness to charity, pleasures, wealth. If the nakṣatra be divided into four parts, birth in the first part is auspicious but in the other three parts indicates loss of wealth, death of father, death of mother. If the child is a girl born on the last three quarters of Āśleṣā indicates the death of the future mother-in-law of the girl; if the child be a boy and is born in the last three quarters of Āśleṣā, that indicates death of his future mother-in-law. One should perform a śānti for birth on any quarter of Āśleṣā, either on the 12th day from birth, or if that be not possible, on the next Āśleṣā or on any auspicious day. On that day he (the father or other performer) should make a saṅkalpa[1247] as noted below

---

1246 a. अथाश्लेषाफलम्। मूर्धास्यनेत्रगलकांसयुगं च बाहू हृज्जानुगुह्यपदमित्यहिदेहभागः। बाणाद्रिनेत्रहुतभुक्-श्रुतिनागरुद्र-षण्नन्द-पञ्च शिरसः क्रमशस्तु नाड्यः। राज्यं पितृक्षयो मातृनाशः कामक्रिया रतिः। पितृभक्तो बली स्वघ्नस्त्यागी भोगी धनी क्रमात्। नि. सि. p. 244; शान्तिरत्नाकर folio 88 b. The presiding deity of Āśleṣā is serpent. The first half of the first verse mentions the head, mouth and other parts of a serpent's body (in all ten). Separate as गलक plus अंसयुगम्.

1247. अस्य शिशोराश्लेषाजननसूचितसर्वारिष्टपरिहारार्थं सग्रहमखां शान्तिं करिष्ये, इति सङ्कल्पयेत्'. The गोमुखप्रसवशान्ति is described in the मदनरत्न (on शान्तिक-पौष्टिक, folios 35 b and 36 a) and in शान्तिमयूख pp. 59-60. On a new *śūrpa* (winnowing basket) a red piece of cloth is spread, the new born child is placed thereon, and is covered with cotton thread from head to the soles of the feet and is put on a heap of sesame, then the child is brought near a cow's mouth. Then (pretending that) the infant is born from a cow's mouth, the child is bathed with cow's milk with the hymn 'Viṣṇur-yonim kalpayatu' (Ṛg. X.184. 1, अथर्व. V. 25. 5 and बृह. उप. VI. 4.21). The infant should receive the touch of the cow's limbs at the hands of the priest with the mantra of Viṣṇu (Ṛg. X. 184. 1). The officiating priest should take the child that is (now imagined as) born from (the mouth of) the cow and

(*Continued on next page*)

after performing the Gomukhaprasava-śānti. He should worship Rudra and Varuṇa on two jars, should invoke the serpents, the lords of Āśleṣā, on an image placed on a jar established on the figure of a lotus with twentyfour petals and invoke Bṛhaspati, the lord of Puṣya nakṣatra, to the south of the jar (for serpents) and the *pitṛs* (the lords of Maghā) to the north of Āśleṣā jar and invoke on the twentyfour petals, beginning from the petal which is due east and proceeding to the right therefrom, twentyfour deities beginning with Bhaga, the lord of Pūrvā Phalguni up to Aditi, lord of Punarvasu; then he should invoke the *lokapālas* (eight); then worship all the deities invoked, establish fire (for homa) and the planets and perform *anvādhāna* (putting fuel on the sacred Agni). After the *anvādhāna* of the Sun and other planets he should offer to the principal deities, viz. the serpents, 108 or 28 of each of the materials viz. pāyasa mixed with ghee, fuel sticks, clarified butter and boiled rice, to Bṛhaspati and pitṛs 28 or 8 offerings of the same materials and to the 24 deities (of nakṣatras) viz Bhaga and the rest eight *āhutis* of pāyasa to each with the verse 'rakṣohaṇam' (Ṛg. X. 87. 1). The other deities are to be worshipped as in śānti for birth on Mūla nakṣatra and the offerings and mantras are to be the same as in that śānti. A śānti for the birth of a child on the 14th tithi of the dark half is still in vogue and the author knows about it personally; it is described at length in the Madanaratna (folio 24 from Gārgya) and in Śānti-kamalākara. The śānti on the birth of a child on Mūla nakṣatra is described in Madanaratna from Garga (folio 27b to 28b,) one peculiarity of which is that the father had to collect one hundred roots of trees and plants (mūla means 'root'). Vide also Śānti-kamalākara (folio 77a).

(*Continued from last page*)

hand it over to the mother who should pass it on to the father who should then return it to the mother The child should be placed on a piece of cloth and the father should look at the face of the infant Then the priest should sprinkle the infant with drops from the mixture of cow's urine, dung, milk, curds and ghee with the mantras beginning with 'Āpo hi ṣṭhā' (Ṛg. X. 9. 1). The father then smells thrice parts of the child's head with the mantra 'thou art born from each limbs of the father &c.' (अङ्गादङ्गात्सम्भवसि हृदयादधिजायसे। आत्मा वै पुत्रनामासि स जीव शरदः शतम्॥) and places it with the mother. This mantra is quoted in Nirukta III. 4 and in the Bṛ. Up. VI. 4. 8. It would be noticed that there is a symbolic simulation of the child (that was born on an unlucky nakṣatra &c.) as having been born from the mouth of a cow (a very sacred animal from Vedic times). Vide धर्मसिन्धु pp. 171-172 for details of गोमुखप्रसवशान्ति. The mantra 'Viṣṇur yonim kalpayatu' is employed in the Garbhādhāna rite.

The birth of a girl after three successive births of boys or of a boy after three successive births of girls was supposed to indicate unfavourable consequences to the parents and the family and death of the eldest, loss of wealth and great sorrow. Therefore a śānti was recommended on the 11th or 12th day from the birth of a girl or boy (as the case may be) or on an auspicious day. He (the father) should choose ācārys (chief officiating priest) and other priests, then perform a sacrifice to planets and offer worship to the golden images of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva and Indra on a jar placed on a heap of grains. On a fifth jar he should worship Rudra and one brāhmaṇa should recite four hymns to Rudra eleven times and all śāntisūktas when homa is being performed. The ācārya should cast into the fire fuel-sticks, ghee, sesame and boiled rice 1008, 108 or 300 times to four deities viz. Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Maheśa and Indra respectively with the mantras 'Brahma jajñānam' (Tai. S. IV. 2. 8. 2, Vāj. S. 13. 3), 'idam Viṣṇur' (Ṛg. I. 22. 17), 'Tryambakam yajāmahe' (Ṛg. VII. 59. 12), 'Yata Indra bhayāmahe' (Ṛg. VIII. 61. 13). Then he should perform 'Sviṣṭakṛt' homa,[1248] then offer bali and *pūrṇāhuti*. The family members should be sprinkled with the sacred water. The performer should honour the ācārya and donate some gold and a cow to him and give *dakṣiṇā* to the other priests, should look into a vessel full of ghee and should make the brāhmaṇas recite śānti verses. The images with the additions or decorations thereof should be donated to the guru, brāhmaṇas, poor and helpless people should be fed according to his ability. By doing this śānti all misfortunes are destroyed. (Nirṇayasindhu p. 248 and Śāntiratnākara, folio 109).

The Kauśikasūtra (kaṇḍikās 110 and 111), Bṛhatsaṁhitā[1249] (chap. 45. 51–54) and the Adbhutasāgara pp. 559–569 deal at length with the portents of births to women, cows, mares, she asses &c. A few passages only are set out here. Varāhamihira [1249] says 'when women give birth to monstrosities, or to two, three, four or more children at the same time or they are delivered much before or after the proper time, then results

1248. For 'Sviṣṭakṛt,' vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 208, 1257 (2nd note). Vide Nirṇayasindhu p. 248 and Dharmasindhu p. 186 for this śānti called 'Trikaprasavaśānti' i. e. śānti on the successive births of a group of three (sons only or daughters only). The शान्तिमयूख (p. 20) prescribes that the 'pūrṇāhuti' is to be cast into fire with the mantra 'Mūrdhānam divo' Ṛg. VI. 7. 1, Vāj. S. VII. 24, Tai. S. I. 4. 13.

1249. प्रसवविकारे स्त्रीणां द्वित्रिचतुःप्रभृतिसंप्रसूतौ वा। हीनातिरिक्तकाले च देशकुलसंक्षयो भवति॥ बृहत्सं. 45. 52.

destruction of the country or family'. The Matsyapurāṇa 235. 1-3 and Viṣṇudharmottara II. 140. 1-3 have identical verses similar to the above. The Bhīṣmaparva [1250] (chap. 3. 2-7) refers to portentous births such as the following; 'pregnant women and women who had never before given birth to sons produce monstrosities; so also even wives of men who are Vedic scholars are giving birth to eagles and peacocks, mares give birth to calves, dogs to jackals; some women have given birth to four or five girls (at the same time) &c.'. The Bṛ. S. proceeds [1251] 'If mares, camels, she-buffaloes and cow-elephants give birth to twins, that portends death to them. The effect of such births will come to pass about six months later; Garga has declared two ślokas as to the śānti in such cases. The women that give birth (to twins or monstrosities) should be removed to another place (or country) by one that desires his own happiness, he should gratify brāhmaṇas by gifts of things desired by them and should cause a śānti (propitiatory rite) to be performed; as to quadrupeds, they should be removed from their flocks or herds and be abandoned in other countries; otherwise there would be ruin of the town, the owner and the flock or herd.'

Various modes were employed to divine the future, viz. (1) the position of planets and stars, (2) individual horoscopes, (3) flight and cries of birds like khañjana and crow, (4) natural phenomena (eclipses, meteors &c.), (5) dreams, (6) voices suddenly heard, (7) the physical and mental conditions of men, animals &c. The first four have already been briefly dealt with. Now dreams will be taken up for discussion.

It has already been seen (p. 728, notes 1157 and 1158) how in the Vedic literature dreams had been associated with good luck or ill-luck. The two epics, the Svapnādhyāya (of Ātharvaṇa-pariśiṣṭa LXVIII pp. 438-449), the Bṛhad-yoga-yātrā of Varāha (chap. 16. 1-31), Purāṇas such as Vāyu (chap. 19. 13-18), Matsya (chap. 242), Viṣṇudharmottara (II. 176), Bhaviṣya I. 194, Brahmavaivarta-purāṇa (Gaṇeśa-khaṇḍa 34. 10-40), describe good or bad dreams; Agni (229, many verses of which are the same

---

1250. गर्भिण्योजातपुत्राश्च जनयन्ति विभीषणान्। ...तथैवान्याश्च दृश्यन्ते स्त्रियो वै ब्रह्मवादिनाम्। वैनतेयान्मयूरांश्च जनयन्ति पुरे तव॥ गोवत्सं वडवा सूते श्वा शृगालं महीपते॥ ...स्त्रियः काश्चित्प्रजायन्ते चतस्रः पञ्च कन्यकाः॥ भीष्म chap. 3. 2, 5-7; अ. सा. pp 562-63 quote these.

1251. वडवोष्ट्रमहिषगोहस्तिनीषु यमलोद्भवे मरणमेषाम्। षण्मासात् सूतिफलं शान्तौ श्लोकौ च गर्गोक्तौ॥ नार्यः परस्य विषये त्यक्तव्यास्ता हितार्थिना। तर्पयेच्च द्विजान्कामैः शान्तिं चैवात्र कारयेत्॥ चतुष्पदाः स्वयूथेभ्यस्त्यक्तव्याः परभूमिषु। नगरं स्वामिनं यूथमन्यथा तु विनाशयेत्॥ बृहत्सं. 45. 53-54, q. by अ. सा. p. 563.

as those of Matsya chap. 242), Bhujabala of Bhoja (pp. 298–304 verses 1347–1378), the Adbhutasāgara pp. 493–515 deal at length with the matters relating to dreams and śāntis therefor. Śaṅkarācārya in his commentary on Vedāntasūtra[1252] remarks that those who have studied the Svapnādhyāya declare that to see oneself riding on an elephant or the like is auspicious and to see oneself sitting in a conveyance drawn by asses is inauspicious (or unlucky). It appears that rarely an ancient writer like Aṅgiras[1253] said 'the movements of planets, dreams, nimittas (like throbbing), utpātas (portents) produce some consequences by chance; wise men are not afraid of them'. Numerous dreams are mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa on several occasions. Some examples may be given. In the Sundarakāṇḍa (chap. 27, 23 ff) Trijaṭā (a *rākṣasī*) details several dreams that she saw and that indicated the destruction of rākṣasas and that were favourable to Rāma. Among the evil omens that she saw in her dream about Rāvaṇa were; he had his head shaved, he drank oil with which he was drenched, he was dressed in red garments, was intoxicated, wore wreaths of Karavīra flowers, he fell on the earth from his puṣpaka balloon, he was carried in a chariot drawn by asses, he was wearing red flowers and was anointed with red unguents &c. (verses 19–27). Similar dreams occur as seen by Trijaṭā in the story of Rāma contained in the Vanaparva chap. 280. verses 64–66. In the Ayodhyākāṇḍa (chap. 69. 8. ff) Bharata who was with his maternal uncle saw in a dream his father (Daśaratha) dirty and with dishevelled hair, falling from a mountain peak in a turbid lake full of cowdung, drinking that dirty water and oil; he also saw the ocean dried up and the moon fallen on the earth, he saw his father seated on a dark seat of iron and wearing black garments and beaten by women dark and tawny in colour, he saw him going to the south in a chariot drawn by asses &c. Bharata says that these dreams indicated the death of the king (Daśaratha) or of Rāma or Lakṣmaṇa. In the Mausalaparva of the Mahābhārata (chap. 3. 1–4) the Yādavas saw in dreams a black woman with whitish teeth running to Dvārakā with a laugh and kidnapping their women and terrible vultures were seen to be devouring the Vṛṣṇis and Andhakas in their own houses in which sacred fires had been established &c.

1252. आचक्षते च स्वप्नाध्यायविदः। कुञ्जरारोहणादीनि स्वप्ने धन्यानि खरयानादीन्यधन्यानीति। शङ्कराचार्य on वेदान्तसूत्र III. 2. 4.

1253. गीतश्चायमर्थोऽङ्गिरसा । ग्रहाणां चरितं स्वप्नो निमित्तौत्पातिकं तथा। फलन्ति काकतालीयं तेभ्यः प्राज्ञा न बिभ्यति॥ वेणीसंहार II. 15.

It is impossible to point out the unlucky and lucky dreams as their number mentioned in Adbhutasāgara (pp. 502–513), quoting the Purāṇas, Parāśara, the works of Varāha and others is extremely large. One passage from the Matsyapurāṇa (242 verses 2–14, quoted in Adbhutasāgara pp. 502–503) is cited here by way of illustration; 'the springing of grass and plants from one's body (except from the navel); bronze vessels dashed against one's head and pulverized; shaving of the head; nakedness; wearing dirty garments; bath with oil; being smeared with mud; fall from a high spot (hill &c.); sitting in a swing, collecting mud and iron; killing horses; ascending trees that have flowers and over circles and riding boars, bears, asses and camels; eating of (the flesh of) birds and fishes and oil and rice mixed with *mudga* or *māṣa*; dancing, laughing, marriage and singing; playing on musical instruments other than stringed ones; going for a dip in a river; bath with water mixed with cowdung or mud or with water fallen on bare earth; entering the womb of one's mother; ascending a funeral pyre; the fall of Indra's banner; the fall of the Sun and the Moon; seeing portents of the three kinds (heavenly, those in atmospheric regions and earthly); anger of gods, brāhmaṇas, kings and one's *gurus*; embracing maidens; sodomy; loss of one's limbs; vomiting and purging; going to the southern direction; being overwhelmed by a disease; fall of fruits and of flowers; fall of houses; sweeping of houses with a broom; playing with goblins, birds or animals that subsist on putrid flesh, monkeys, bears and men; humiliation by strangers (or enemies); arising of calamity brought on by another person (or enemy); wearing ochre-coloured garments; playing with women; plunging into oil or drinks; wearing red flowers and applying red unguents; these and others are inauspicious dreams.

In the Bṛhadyogayātrā[1254] Varāha prescribes that the king wearing silken garments, pearls and jewels and accompanied by

---

1254. यज्जाग्रतो दूरमुदैति दैवमावर्त्य मन्त्रान् प्रयतस्त्रिरेतान्। लब्ध्वैकभुग्दक्षिणपार्श्वशायी स्वप्नं परीक्षेत यथोपदेशम्॥ नमः शम्भो त्रिनेत्राय रुद्राय वरदाय च। वामनाय विरूपाय स्वप्नाधिपतये नमः। भगवन् देवदेवेश शूलभृद्वृषवाहन। इष्टानिष्टे समाचक्ष्व स्वप्ने सुप्तस्य शाश्वतम्॥ बृहद्योगयात्रा q. by अ. सा. p. 494; the two verses नमः शम्भो occur in विष्णुधर्मोत्तर II. 176. 9–10 and also the reference to 'yajjāgrato' (occurs in verse 11). That first mantra is यज्जाग्रतो दूरमुदैति दैवं तदु सुप्तस्य तथैवैति। दूरङ्गमं ज्योतिषां ज्योतिरेकं तन्मे मनः शिवसङ्कल्पमस्तु॥ (वाज. सं. 34. 1). This hymn is called शिवसङ्कल्प (vide मनु XI. 250).

astrologers and *purohita* should enter the temple of his favourite deity, should place the images of the *dikpālas* therein, worship them with mantras, place four jars full of water in the four directions, should thrice repeat the mantras beginning with 'Yajjāgrato dūram' (Vāj. S. 34. 1), should eat only once that day, sleep on his right side and pray to Rudra (as noted in *n* 1254) and examine the dream, auspicious or inauspicious, seen towards the close of night.

The Matsya (242. 21–35) sets out[1255] lucky dreams as follows: ascending (or riding on) mountains, palaces, elephants, horses and bulls; going among trees having white flowers; the shooting of trees and grass from the navel and seeing (the sleeper) endowed with many hands or heads; wearing garlands of very white flowers and very white garments; eclipse of the Sun, Moon and nakṣatras; sprinkling water (on one's body) all over; embracing or raising the banner of Indra; seizure of the earth and seas; slaughter of enemies; victory in disputes, in gambling and in battle; eating of wet (fresh) meat, of fish and of pāyasa (rice boiled in milk and sugar); seeing blood or being bathed with it; drinking liquor, blood, intoxicants and milk; being surrounded on the earth with intestines; sight of bright sky; sucking the udders (the milk) of cows and she-buffaloes and of lionesses, cow-elephants and mares; receiving favours from (images of) gods, *gurus* and brāhmaṇas; bath with water flowing from the horns of cows or falling from the Moon (this prognosticates the acquisition of a kingdom); being crowned as a king; the cutting of one's head; one's death; being burnt by fire; one's house and the like being burnt down by fire; securing the insignia of royalty; playing on the lute; swimming beyond waters; crossing difficult places; the delivery in one's own house of cows, mares and cow-elephants; being mounted on horses; weeping; obtaining of handsome women or embracing them; being bound with fetters; being smeared with excreta; seeing living kings and friends; seeing images of gods and pure (or pellucid) waters. On seeing such auspicious dreams a man easily secures permanent wealth and he who is suffering from a disease becomes free from it.

In the Jain Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu (S. B. E. vol. XXII. p. 129) fourteen very auspicious dreams seen by the brāhmaṇī Devānandā are enumerated, viz. an elephant, a bull, a lion,

1255. This long passage from Matsya about auspicious dreams is quoted as from Viṣṇupurāṇa and Viṣṇudharmottara by अ. का. pp. 499–500.

anointing of the goddess Śrī, a garland, the Moon, the Sun, a flag, a vase, a lotus lake, the ocean, celestial abode, a heap of jewels, a flame and on pp. 231–238 elaborate details of these dreams are given.

Matsya (chap. 243. 2–12) sets out the sights that are unlucky when they come before a king who is going on an invasion (such as improper drugs, corn with dark exterior, cotton, grass, dry cowdung and many others) and prescribes that on seeing these for the first time he should worship Keśava with a laud and that if he sees it a second time he should enter his palace. Yogayātrā (chap. 13. 4 ff) provides what the king starting on an expedition should hear viz. such recitations as that of the Veda, Vedāṅgas, Dharmaśāstras, Arthaśāstra, Mahābhārata, Rāmāyaṇa, Purāṇa passages. Matsya (chap. 243. 15–25) prescribes the sights that are auspicious (such as white flowers, jars full of water, aquatic birds, meat and fish, flaming fire, courtezans, Dūrvā grass, fresh cowdung, gold, silver, copper and all jewels besides several others and winds up with a fine sentiment,[1256] viz. the ease (or satisfaction) of one's mind is the highest sign of success; on one side are all prognostications and on the other is the mind's ease. The Bṛhad-yogayātrā of Varaha has a similar verse. Vide H. of Dh. vol, II pp. 511, 876 and notes 1192 and 2048 therein for two sets of auspicious sights. The Jyotistattva (pp. 729–730) quotes several verses on the objects that are auspicious or inauspicious when seen by a person starting on a journey or expedition and remarks that the same objects when seen in a dream are of the same (auspicious or inauspicious) quality. The Vasantarāja-śākuna (V. 2–6) sets out fifty objects that are auspicious when starting on a journey or entering a home such as curds, sandal wood, ghee, dūrvā, a jar full of water &c. and (V. 10–11) specifies the thirty objects that are inauspicious.

The Matsya provides[1257]: "dreams seen in the first watch of the night bear fruit in a year, those seen in the 2nd watch after

---

1256. मनसस्तुष्टिरेवात्र परमं जयलक्षणम् । एकतः सर्वलिङ्गानि मनसस्तुष्टिरेकतः ॥ मत्स्य 243. 27, विष्णुधर्मोत्तर II. 163. 32; प्रष्टव्यो दैवविदा विश्रब्धमुपह्वरे नराधिपतिः । रिपुनिधनप्रणिधानं प्रति भवतां किं मनः कुरुते । ब्रूयात्स चेन्मम मनः प्रोत्सहते हर्षयेत्ततश्चैनम् । चित्तानुकूलता सिद्धिलक्षणं तत्र श्लोकाः ॥ शुभाशुभानि सर्वाणि निमित्तानि स्युरेकतः । एकतस्तु मनःशुद्धिस्तद्विशुद्धं जयावहम् ॥ बृहद्योगयात्रा chap. 14. 1–3 (ms. rather corrupt); एकतश्च सकलानि निमित्तान्येकतश्च मनसः परिशुद्धिः । चेतसोऽपि सहयानरणे (v. l. सहसास्ति रणे) भीमाकृतोपि विजयाजयहेतुः ॥ बृहद्योगयात्रा XIX. 1.

1257. एषां सङ्कथनं धन्यं भूयः प्रस्वापनं तथा । कल्कस्नानं तिलैर्होमो ब्राह्मणानां च पूजनम् । स्तुतिश्च वासुदेवस्य तथा तस्यैव पूजनम् । नागेन्द्रमोक्षश्रवणं ज्ञेयं दुःस्वप्ननाशनम् ॥

(*Continued on next page*)

six months, those seen in the third watch after three months and those seen in the last watch in a month. If on the same night one sees both auspicious and inauspicious dreams, one (the astrologer) should declare that the last dream (alone) will yield consequences. Therefore, when a person sees an auspicious dream he should not go to sleep thereafter. Declaring a bad dream to another is commended as also sleeping after seeing it; bath with water mixed with the viscous sediment of oily substances, *homa* of sesame, honouring brāhmaṇas, hymn of praise to Vāsudeva and worship of him and listening to the story of the liberation of Gajendra—these remove the evil effects of bad dreams." In connection with the vrata called 'Siddhārthakādi-saptamī' performed for gaining the favour of the Sun the Bhaviṣya (Brāhma-parva, 194. 1–25) sets out the dreams which are auspicious or favourable to the person performing the vrata. Those verses are similar to those in the Matsya and are quoted by Kṛtyakalpataru (on vrata pp. 176–179). One verse says 'on seeing a favourable dream one should not sleep again, but declare in the morning the dream as seen to Bhojakas and brāhmaṇas (or to Bhojaka brāhmaṇas).' The Bṛhadyoga-yātrā contains similar verses as quoted by Adbhutasāgara p. 501.

The Jyotistattva quotes [1258] a verse 'I shall declare what matters seen in dreams tend to bring knowledge (of impending consequences) to men who do not understand the true nature

---

(Continued from last page)

स्वमास्तु प्रथमे यामे संवत्सरविपाकिनः। षड्भिर्मासैर्द्वितीये तु त्रिभिर्मासैस्तृतीयके। चतुर्थे मासमात्रेण पश्यन्ते नात्र संशयः। ...एकस्यां यदि वा रात्रौ शुभं वा यदि वाशुभम्। पश्चाद् दृष्टस्तु यस्तत्र तस्य पाकं विनिर्दिशेत्। तस्माच्छोभनके स्वप्ने पश्चात्स्वप्नो न शस्यते। मत्स्य 242. 15–20; all these are q. by अ. सा. on pp. 501, 502 and 514 and the first four also from विष्णुधर्मोत्तर by अ. सा. p. 514. For नागेन्द्रमोक्ष (i. e. more familiarly गजेन्द्रमोक्ष), vide वामनपुराण 85, विष्णुधर्मोत्तर I. 194, पद्म VI. 112. 18–20. The अथर्वपरिशिष्ट LXVIII (2. 56 at p. 445) says: 'शुभं वाप्यशुभं वापि पश्चात्तत्फलं लभेत्। स्वमास्तु प्रथमे यामे संवत्सरविपाकिनः॥ द्वितीयेऽष्टसु मासेषु तृतीये तु तदर्धभाक्। मासिके गोविसर्गे तु सद्यः पाकः प्रभातिके॥'; दृष्ट्वा तु शोभनं स्वप्नं न भूयः शयनं व्रजेत्। प्रातश्च कीर्तयेत्स्वप्नं यथा दृष्टं खगाधिप। प्राज्ञो भोजकविप्रेभ्यः सुहृदां देवतासु च। भविष्य q. in कृत्यकल्प० on व्रत pp. 178–179. For मगs and भोजकs vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 722 note 1727. In वेणीसंहार II (between verses 2 and 3) the चेटी says 'अकुशलदर्शना अपि स्वप्नाः प्रशंसया कुशलपरिणामा भवन्तीति श्रूयते।.'

1258. अविज्ञातस्वरूपाणां नराणां ज्ञानहेतवे। स्वप्ने दृष्टानि वक्ष्यामि पुण्यपापोद्भवानि च॥ एवं चैषां सूचकत्वं न कारकत्वम्। ज्योतिस्तत्त्व p. 730; सूचकश्च हि श्रुतेराचक्षते च तद्विदः। वेदान्तसूत्र III. 2. 4, on which the शाङ्करभाष्य is "सूचकश्च हि स्वप्नो भवति भविष्यतोः साध्वसाधुनोः। तथाहि श्रूयते 'यदा कर्मसु...निदर्शने'॥." This last verse is छा. उप. V. 2. 9.

(significance) of objects seen in dreams that arise from their meritorious or sinful actions (in previous lives)' and remarks that from this verse it follows that dreams are purely indicative and do not *produce* consequences (by themselves). The higher thought in India held that dreams were only indicative or suggestive of future auspicious or inauspicious events, as affirmed by the Vedāntasūtra (III. 2.4) and by Śaṅkarācārya's commentary thereon. On the other hand Bhujabala provides[1259] 'to sleep again (after a dream), not to declare it to another, bath in the Ganges, *japa* (of holy texts), śānti, *svastyayana* (asking brāhmaṇas to say 'it would be auspicious'), to resort in the morning to cows and an Aśvattha tree, honouring brāhmaṇas with food mixed with sesame, with gold and flowers according to one's means, merit-giving recital of the Mahābhārata—these tend to destroy (the effects of) bad dreams.' Bhujabala further says that all white objects except cotton, ashes, bones, buttermilk are auspicious (in dreams) and all dark objects except cows, images of gods, elephants, horses and brāhmaṇas are inauspicious.

The Ātharvaṇa-pariśiṣṭa[1260] LXVIII (pp. 438–449) states that persons have different dreams according as their constitutions (*prakṛti*) are choleric or windy or phlegmatic (*pitta*, *vāta* and *kapha*) and long lists of dreams and their interpretations are given and it prescribes the same remedies against bad dreams as Varāha does.

1259. भूयः प्रस्वपनं न चास्य (तथास्य ?) कथनं गङ्गाभिषेको जपः शान्तिः स्वस्त्ययनं निषेवणमपि प्रातर्गवाश्वत्थयोः। विप्रेभ्यश्च तिलान्नहेमकुसुमैः पूजा यथाशक्तितः पुण्यं भारतकीर्तनं च कथितं दुःस्वप्नविच्छित्तये॥ सर्वाणि शुक्लानि सुशोभनानि कार्पासभस्मास्थि च तक्रवर्जम्। सर्वाणि कृष्णानि न शोभनानि गोदेवहस्तिद्विजवाजिवर्जम्॥ भुजबल p. 304 (first verse) and p. 310 (2nd verse). अ. सा. p. 514 quotes the verse भूयः प्रस्वपनं° from वराह. On अथ स्वस्त्ययनं वाचयीत (आश्व. गृ. I. 8. 15), नारायण explains 'ओं स्वस्ति भवन्तो ब्रुवन्त्विति ते च ओं स्वस्तीति प्रत्यूचुः।'.

1260. विप्रेभ्यः शक्तितो दानं शान्तिः स्वस्त्ययनादयः। विनाशयन्ति दुःस्वप्नं प्रातश्चाश्वत्थसेवनम्॥ अश्वत्थसेवा तिलपात्रदानं गोस्पर्शनं ब्राह्मणतर्पणं च। शान्तिक्रिया स्वस्त्ययनक्रिया च दुःस्वप्नमेतानि विनाशयन्ति॥ आथर्वणपरिशिष्ट LXVIII (स्वप्नाध्याय) 2.60 (p. 445); 'अथ दुःस्वप्नदर्शने कृत्यम्। यो मे राजन्नित्यृचा सूर्योपस्थाने दुःस्वप्ननाशः। अथ स्वप्नस्येति जपाद्वा कश्चिद्दर्शपश्चाद्धेन दुःस्वप्ननाशः, चण्डीसप्तशतीपाठेन वा। यद्वा श्रीविष्णुसहस्रनामस्तोत्रजपः कार्यः। अथवा श्रीभारतस्थस्य श्रीमद्भागवतस्थस्य वा गजेन्द्रमोक्षस्य श्रवणं पाठो वा। धर्मसिन्धु p. 361. ऋ. II. 28.10 is यो मे राजन्युज्यो वा सखा वा स्वप्ने भयं भीरवे मह्यमाह। स्तेनो वा यो दिप्सति नो वृको वा त्वं तस्माद्वरुण पाह्यस्मान्॥. This is obviously addressed to वरुण and it is strange that it is recommended for the worship of सूर्य by the धर्मसिन्धु. For Saptaśatī, vide above p. 155 n 396. For the thousand names of Viṣṇu, vide Anuśāsanaparva 149. 14–120 and for गजेन्द्रमोक्ष. भागवत VIII. 2.

The Dharmasindhu (pp. 359-360) collects in one place numerous dreams that are lucky or auspicious and that are unlucky or inauspicious and then prescribes (p. 361) the remedies to avert the consequences of unlucky dreams viz. worship of the Sun with the mantra (Ṛg. II. 28. 10, Tai. S. IV. 14-123) 'O king Varuṇa! protect us from the danger which my helper or friend declares to me (from what I saw) in a dream or from the thief or wolf who desires or is about to injure us'; or one may recite inaudibly the verse 'Adha svapnasya' (Ṛg. I. 120.12) or perform a śrāddha like the one on Amāvāsyā, or should recite the Saptaśatī in honour of Caṇḍī or the thousand names of Viṣṇu or recite or listen to the recitation of the liberation of Gajendra in the Bhārata or Bhāgavata.

All ancient countries and peoples believed in dreams and satisfied their curiosity to know the future by interpreting them. The Chaldean astrologers and dream-interpreters were in high favour at Babylonian and Assyrian courts. The Book of Daniel (chap. 2) tells us how Nebuchadnezzar, a great king of Babylon, asked the Chaldeans not only to interpret dreams but commanded them on threat of death to make known to him the dream which he had forgotten and then to interpret it. Plato, the greatest of the Greek philosophers, regards dreams as important physical and psychic symptoms while certain dreams are conceded as of supernatural origin and explains in his Timaeus (chap. 46 and 47) that dreams are prophetic visions received by the lower appetitive soul (through the liver). In JRAS (old series) vol. 16 pp. 118-171 N. Bland contributes a long and interesting article on 'the Mahomedan science of Tābir or interpretation of dreams.' There are striking parallels between the rules to be observed by the dreamer and by the interpreter and the principles of interpretation (of dreams) by contraries and by dependence upon the religion, country and bodily conditions (such as total fast or full stomach) of the dreamer. On p. 141 of JRAS there is an interesting account of a dream of Nushirwan, a Sassanian king (531-579 A. D.), who saw a dream that he drank from a golden goblet and that a black hog put its head in the goblet and drank from it. Then we are told 'Buzurmihr, his minister, whom he consulted, told him it signified that his favourite princess had a black slave who was her lover and suggested that the women of his harem should be ordered to dance undressed in the presence of the king. One of them showing some hesitation in complying and being protected by the others was discovered to be a Hindu male slave and the

Vazir's interpretation was verified.' The name of the Vazir remarkably agrees in sound with the name Varāhamihira and it is not very fantastic to suppose that Varāhamihira, probably the most famous astrologer and astronomer of early times in India, had been patronized by Nushirvan and held a high position in his court. Chronology is quite in favour of this identification since Varāhamihira takes *śaka* 427 (505 A. D.) as the starting point for finding out the *ahargaṇa*.

In modern[1261] times many educated people think dreams as of no consequence whatever, while there are others who regard dreams as almost infallible indicators of coming events; there is also a third class of people who are willing to listen to the arguments advanced on behalf of the interpreters of dreams and also of those who regard thoughts on the use and value of dreams as frivolous. To those who want to hear arguments on both sides and to form a judgment of their own about dreams, I would recommend the 'Fabric of Dreams' by Catherine Taylor Craig (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, London, 1918); Freud's 'Interpretation of dreams' is the most important of his works, in which he develops his psycho-analytic technique. Then there is the work 'Second sight in daily life' by W. H. W. Sabine who has a theory of his own. His work deals with precognition (or foreknowledge) which according to him is a subdivision of Extra-sensory perception. He propounds the theory that the mind comprises of not only normal memory appearing to derive from physical perception but also 'anticipatory memory' deriving from the Basic Experience which from time to time passes to some degree into conscious awareness. Time is one and does not exist except as a verbal convenience and that what we call 'future' has already happened but it is not indicated in what form it has happened. Considerations of space and relevance preclude further discussion of this subject here.

Certain other interesting śāntis will now be described. When a great-grandson (prapautra i. e. a son's son's son)[1262]

1261. Dr. R. G. Harshe contributes to the 'Shri K. M. Munshi Jubilee volume' (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay 1948) an interesting paper (pp. 241-268) on 'two illustrated manuscripts on dreams', the contents of which do not attempt any elaborate theory about dreams but record empirical observations on dreams for the guidance of people in general.

1262. For the importance of the great-grandson, vide the verse पुत्रेण लोकाञ्जयति पौत्रेणानन्त्यमश्नुते। अथ पुत्रस्य पौत्रेण ब्रध्नस्याप्नोति विष्टपम्॥ मनु. IX, 137 = वसिष्ठ 17. 5 = विष्णुधर्मसूत्र 15. 46.

is born to a person a śānti has to be performed when he sees the face of the great-grandson. The saṅkalpa[1263] is given below. He should perform the rites beginning with the worship of Gaṇeśa and ending with Mātṛpūjā, then establish a jar full of water and worship (the image of) Varuṇa therein, perform the rite of *nīrājana*[1264] to the accompaniment of the sound of drums, sit on a seat of udumbara tree covered with a blanket and should request brāhmaṇas to sprinkle sacred water on his person. The brāhmaṇas should sprinkle water on him to the accompaniment of a hymn to Varuṇa and a hymn to the Ganges. At the end of the *abhiṣeka* the performer should give up old garments and wear new ones and should worship the Ganges. Melted ghee should be put in a vessel of bronze and the performer should see the reflection of his face therein and then should see the face of his great-grandson in the light of a lamp placed in a golden vessel. Then he should sprinkle drops of water on the great-grandson with one hundred flowers of gold. Then he should sprinkle the great-grandson with water from the jar used for *abhiṣeka*. For completing the ceremony of seeing the face of the grandson, he should donate a cow and feed brāhmaṇas according to his means. Then he should worship an image of Viṣṇu, offer *pāyasa* to it and address the following prayer[1265] 'O Viṣṇu! by your favour I have seen the face of my great-grandson. Therefore, O Lord! in all ways and always do what I desire'. Then the image should be donated with the mantra 'by the donation of the image (of Viṣṇu) may all evil influences of planets be always conjured away in the case of the child, O enemy of Kaṁsa and the Lord of the worlds,' and he should donate to the brāhmaṇas the ghee in which he saw his face.

One of the śāntis that is frequently performed even in these days is 'Udakaśānti'. It is performed for averting the consequences of many happenings and for securing certain benefits

---

1263. मम ब्रह्मलोकावाप्तिसर्वतीर्थयात्रासकलदानजन्यपुण्यजातावाप्तिद्वारा श्रीपरमेश्वरप्रीत्यर्थं प्रपौत्रमुखदर्शनं करिष्ये। तदङ्गं गणेशपूजनं स्वस्तिपुण्याहवाचनं मातृकापूजनं नान्दीश्राद्धं च करिष्ये इति सङ्कल्प्य।

1264. For Nīrājana 'waving of lights before men, horses', vide H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 230-231. The Bṛ. S. 43.2 regards नीराजन as a Śānti 'द्वादश्यामष्टम्यां कार्तिकशुक्लस्य पञ्चदश्यां वा। आश्वयुजे वा कुर्यान्नीराजनसंज्ञितां शान्तिम्॥.'

1265. The प्रार्थनामन्त्र *is:* 'भो विष्णो त्वत्प्रसादेन मुखमालोकितं मया। तस्मात्कुरु ममाभीष्टं सर्वदा सर्वथा प्रभो॥', the दानमन्त्र is: प्रतिमायाः प्रदानेन बालकस्य सदा ग्रहाः। शमं यान्तु देवेश कंसारे जगतां पते॥.

such as good health, the removal of the diseases due to the three constituent elements of the human body, viz. bile, phlegm and *vāta* (wind), that may have already arisen or are likely to arise, or for mitigating all the trouble that is caused by planets occupying unfavourable positions from the *lagna* in a person's horoscope or from the *rāśi* of his birth, for removing the impurity on birth or death in one's house or family, for securing a happy life. Therefore, the saṅkalpa may assume various forms that are noted below.[1266] In modern times this is a very elaborate rite in which a very large number of Vedic verses are repeated and which takes up about three hours for its performance. Therefore, even a brief resume of the modern procedure is not attempted here. But one of the oldest available descriptions of this rite contained in the Baudhāyana-gṛhya-śeṣasūtra (I. 14) is set out here in order to convey an idea of this śānti. As the Baudhāyana-sūtras are closely connected with the Taittirīya-saṁhitā and Brāhmaṇa the references to mantras and texts are cited as far as possible from that Saṁhitā and Brāhmaṇa. Many of the mantras occur also in the Ṛgveda and other saṁhitās. Here are the texts; waters indeed are faith; (when a priest takes water) he begins (the rite with) faith itself; waters are indeed the sacrifice, he begins sacrifice itself; water is indeed thunderbolt, he strikes the thunderbolt against enemies; waters are destroyers of malignant spirits (and it is taken) for destroying evil spirits; waters are the favourite abode (or seat) of the gods; waters are indeed nectar; therefore people sprinkle with water him who faints; waters are indeed all gods; he begins with gods. Waters indeed are well disposed; he (priest) removes with the kindly (waters) the pain of this person (the sacrificer); this is (what) the Brāhmaṇa (text) says.

Therefore (the priest) prepares propitiatory[1267] water with two *kuśas* dipped therein. One should commence a śānti on the nakṣatra of (a person's birth) or on an auspicious nakṣatra or when auspicious rites are to be performed, viz. marriage, a (child's) tonsure, *upanayana*, Vedic student's return home, hairparting (of a pregnant woman), establishment of the Vedic fires and other

---

1266. मम शरीरे उत्पन्नोत्पत्स्यमानकफवातपित्तोद्भूतसमस्तामयानां जीवच्छरीराविरोधेन समूलनिवृत्तिपूर्वकक्षिप्रारोग्यावाप्त्यर्थं मम जन्मलग्नजन्मराशिभ्यां सकाशादनिष्टस्थानस्थित-रव्यादिग्रहजनित-जनिष्यमाण-सकलपीडापरिहारार्थं मम गृहे अशुचित्वादिदोषपरिहारार्थं वा क्षेमायुःसिद्ध्यर्थं वा उदकशान्तिं करिष्ये।

1267. The words 'vajro vā āpaḥ' (water is indeed thunderbolt) occur frequently in the Sat. Br. I. 1. 1. 17, I. 2. 5. 20, I. 7. 1. 20 &c.

rites, or when a planet is eclipsed, or when a planet indicates a portent, or when danger comes (to a person) from bipeds or quadruped animals.[1268] He should make an even number of brāhmaṇas wash well their hands and feet and make them sip water, seat them on seats in each of the directions, should smear with cowdung a four-cornered altar of the extent of a bull's hide, should himself sit on *darbhas* with face towards the east, should hold darbhas and dūrvā grass, have two kuśas in his hand, should sprinkle with water the altar made by him, should draw lines thereon and sprinkle water over them and should spread over it dūrvā grass and darbhas and sprinkle it with water scented with sandalwood paste and cover it with flowers, should wrap with (cotton) threads the sacred vessel[1268a] of palāśa leaves and place it on them (darbhas and dūrvā) with the mantra 'brahma jajñānam' (Tai. S. IV. 2. 8. 2). Then he pours water across the two blades of darbha grass and mutters 'tat-savitur-vareṇyam' (Ṛg. III. 62. 10) and throws in (the water) whole grains of rice and yavas with the formula 'bhūr-bhuvaḥ-suvarom' (Tai. Ā. X. 2.1). Then he spreads around flowers, dūrvā grass and fruits, covers it (jar) with dūrvās and darbhas and touches with the verse 'śan-no devīr' (Ṛg. X. 9. 4). When the brāhmaṇas have placed themselves besides the officiating priest, he mutters the verse 'tat-savitur-vareṇyam' (Ṛg. X. 62. 10) separately by each foot and by half verse in one breath and mutters the first words of (all) the Vedas. Then he recites the following[1269] viz. the *anuvāka* beginning with 'kṛṇuṣva pājaḥ' (Tai. S. I. 2. 14) but omitting the half verse 'made cid-asya' (Tai. S. I. 2. 14. 7), the anuvāka beginning with 'indram vo' (Tai. S. I. 6. 12), with the two verses 'yata indra' (Ṛg. VIII. 61. 13, Tai. Ā. X. 1. 9), and 'svastidā' (Ṛg. X. 152. 2, Tai. Ā. X. 1. 9), with the two verses 'Mahān Indro' (Tai. S. I. 4. 41) and 'sajoṣā Indra' (Tai. S. I. 4. 42), with 'Ye devāḥ purassado' (Tai S. I. 8. 7. 1) repeated

---

1268. Compare कौशिकसूत्र IX. 8 'अहतवासाः कंसे शान्त्युदकं करोति।'.

1268 a. Vide पैठीनसि quoted by स्मृतिच. I. p. 222 'ब्रह्मपात्रे तु यो भुंक्ते मासमेकं निरन्तरम्। त्रिंशच्चान्द्रायणैस्तुल्यं महापातकनाशनम्॥ सौवर्णे राजते पात्रे ताम्रे पद्मपलाशयोः॥ भोजने भोजने चैव त्रिरात्रफलमश्नुते॥ ब्रह्मपात्रं पलाशपात्रम्। पुराणेऽपि। पालाशेषु च पत्रेषु मध्यमेषु च भारत। यः करोत्यशनं तस्य प्राजापत्यं दिने दिने॥. Compare लघुशातातप verse 162.

1269. It may be noticed that most of the verses to be recited speak of destroying evil spirits (rakṣas) or enemies, pray for welfare and happiness (*svasti* and *śarma*), for freedom from danger, for protection, for long life &c.

five times, with the five formulas 'Agnaye rakṣoghne' (Tai. S. I. 8. 7. 2), with the five formulas 'Agnir-āyuṣmān' (Tai. S. II. 3. 10. 3), with four clauses 'yā vām-indrāvaruṇā' (Tai. S. II. 3. 13. 1), with the eight clauses 'Yo vām-Indrāvaruṇau' (Tai. S. II. 3. 13. 3), with the four verses 'Agne yaśasvin' (Tai. S. V. 7. 4. 3), the Rāṣṭrabhṛt anuvāka beginning with 'ṛtāṣād-ṛtadhāmā' (Tai. S. III. 4. 7. 1), with the three mantras 'namo astu sarpebhyaḥ'[1270] (Tai. S. IV. 2. 8. 3), with 'ayam puro harikeśaḥ' (Tai. S. IV. 4. 3. 1) repeated five times, with the Apratiratha[1271] anuvāka beginning with 'āśuḥ śiśānaḥ' (Tai. S. IV. 6. 4. 1), the anuvāka beginning with 'śam ca me mayaśca me' (Tai. S. IV. 7. 3. 1), the anuvāka called 'vihavya' beginning with 'mamāgne varco vihaveṣvastu' (Tai. S. IV. 7.14. 1), the Mṛgāra anuvāka[1272] beginning with 'Agner-manve' (Tai. S. IV. 4. 15. 1–11), the offering mantras to serpents beginning with 'samīcī nāmāsi prācī dik' six times repeated, the offering prayers to Gandharvas in the six clauses beginning with 'hetayo nāma stha' (Tai. S. V. 5, 10. 3–4); the five 'ajyāni (bricks) offerings with 'śatāyudhāya' (Tai. S. V. 7. 2. 3), the anuvāka beginning with 'bhūtam bhavyam bhaviṣyat' (Tai. S. VII. 3. 12. 1), the Atharva-śiras,[1273] the anuvāka beginning with 'Indro Dadhīco asthabhiḥ' (Tai. Br. I. 5. 8. 1, Ṛg. I. 84. 13), the Pratyaṅgirasa beginning with 'cakṣuṣo hete' up to 'bhrātṛvyam pādayāmasi' (Tai. Br. II. 4. 2. 1–4), the anuvāka beginning with 'prāṇo rakṣati viśvam-ejat' (Tai. Br. II. 5. 1. 1), the anuvāka beginning with 'siṁhe vyāghra uta yā pṛdākau' (Tai. Br. II. 7. 7. 1); the anuvāka beginning with 'aham-asmi' (Tai.

1270. It is difficult to construe the printed text here. It runs: 'नमो अस्तु सर्पेभ्यः' इति तिसृभिरनु च च्छन्दसं पञ्चचोडा 'अयं पुरो हरिकेशः' इति पञ्चभिः पर्यायैः &c. ' पञ्चचोडा means a brick with five protuberances. The तै. सं. V. 3. 7. 2 has पञ्चचोडा उपदधात्यप्सरस एवैनमेता भूता अमुष्मिँल्लोक उप शेरे' which means 'He puts down the bricks with five crests (protuberances), indeed these becoming Apsarases lie down near him in the yonder world'. But there is no mantra here. Besides अनु च च्छन्दसं is not clear. Is it अनुच्छन्दसम् with च inserted between अनु and छन्दसम् or is it a printer's mistake?

1271. Kātyāyana in his Srāddhasūtra prescribes that among the holy texts to be recited when the brāhmaṇas are eating the śrāddha dinner are the Rākṣoghnī verses and the Apratiratha hymn. Ṛg. X. 103 has most of the verses called Apratiratha in Tai. S. IV. 6. 4.

1272. The printed text reads 'sṛgāram'. Vide Kauśikasūtra IX. 1 for Mṛgāra-sūktāni.

1273. The Atharvaśiras is an Upaniṣad beginning with 'Devā vai svargam lokam-āyan'. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV, pp. 45–46 note.

Br. II. 8. 8. 1), the anuvāka 'tā sūryācandramasā' (Tai. Br. II. 8. 9. 1), the three anuvākas beginning with 'agnir naḥ pātu' (Vāj. S. 4. 15), the anuvāka 'ṛdhyāsma' (Tai. Br. III. 1.2.1), the anuvāka 'navo navo' (Tai. S. II. 3. 5. 3), with (the mantras of) supplementary sacrifices, with a verse containing the word 'surabhi' (Tai. S. I. 5. 11. 4 or VII. 4. 19. 4), with verses addressed to waters (Ṛg. X. 9. 1-3 = Tai. S. V. 6. 1. 4 ff), with verses addressed to Varuṇa, with the verses beginning with 'Hiraṇya-varṇāḥ' (Tai. S. V. 6. 1), verses addressed to (Soma) Pavamāna (from Ṛg. IX. 1. 1 'svādiṣṭhayā' to end of Ṛg. IX), with the Vyāhṛtis (seven mystic words, bhūḥ, bhuvaḥ, svaḥ, mahaḥ, janaḥ, tapaḥ, satyam), the anuvāka beginning with 'tac-chaṁyor' (Tai. B. III. 5. 11). He repeats thrice the concluding passage 'namo brahmaṇe'.[1273a]

The (officiating priest) makes the performer rise from his seat and sprinkles water on him to the accompaniment of the Vyāhṛtis (bhūḥ &c.). (The performer) makes gifts (to the officiating priest). Then the officiating priest sprinkles sacred water on those that are possessed by an evil spirit or attacked by fever or troubled by ghosts, that are the friends, relatives, agents of the king's and of the royal priests, and the young and old members (of the performer's family), pregnant women, persons suffering from bad diseases, persons suffering from diseases for a long time, persons that are emaciated and are sick; also sprinkles sacred water on the elephants, horses, camels, cows, buffaloes, goats, sheep and servants of the performer; in this way the rite is performed for one day, three or five or seven days. Thus doing he wards off death; so says the blessed Baudhāyana."

When a person's nakṣatra of birth is afflicted by an evil planet or aspect Parāśara provided a śānti as follows:[1274] after putting in a jar full of water the dung and urine of a white bull and the milk of a white cow and *kuśas* the person should be

---

1273 a. The तै. आ. II. 13. 4 has the very words 'नमो ब्रह्मण इति परिधानीयां त्रिरन्वाह' that occur in बौ. गृ. शे. सू. The verse is 'नमो ब्रह्मणे नमोस्त्वग्नये नमः पृथिव्यै नम ओषधीभ्यः। नमो वाचे नमो वाचस्पतये नमो विष्णवे बृहते करोमि॥' (तै. आ. II. 12). The verse occurs in आश्व. गृ. (III. 5. 4), which reads महते for बृहते.

1274. अथ शान्तिमाह पराशरः। तत्र जन्मर्क्षोपतापे श्वेतवृषभस्य शकृन्मूत्रं तद्वर्णायाश्च गोः पयः कुशांश्चोदकुम्भे निधायाभिषेचनं कुर्यात्। अ. सा. p. 271. The विष्णुधर्मोत्तर is quoted by मदनरत्न (on शान्तिक folio 20b) 'शकृन्मूत्रे तु संगृह्य श्वेतस्य वृषभस्य तु। श्वेतगोपयसा सार्धं स्नातव्यं कुशवारिणा। जन्मनक्षत्रपीडायां तस्मात् क्लेशाद्विमुच्यते॥'.

sprinkled with the mixture. Similarly, the Matsya[1275] prescribes for one in whose birth rāśi an eclipse takes place a sacred bath with water from four jars full of water in which earth from the stables of horses, elephants, from an ant-hill, from a confluence, a deep reservoir of water, from a cowpen and from entrance of a palace is cast, and also *pañcagavya*, five jewels, *rocanā*, lotuses, sandalwood, saffron, *uśīra*, *guggulu*; mantras also are to accompany the bath; Indra, Varuṇa, Kubera and other gods are invoked for removing the evil results of eclipses.

If a person suffers from fever the Madanaratna (folio 11) provides for śāntis for the tithis (from the first onwards) on which the fever started, derived from Baudhāyana in which the presiding deity of each tithi is to be offered worship (pūjā) and homa, for each of which the mantra (of which *japa* is to be made) is different, and the incense, flowers, naivedya also are different. There are also śāntis, when a person suffers from fever, about the weekday on which the fever started and images of the presiding deity of the weekday made of different metals according to the name of the day are to be worshipped with different mantras (Madanaratna, folio 12a). For example, if fever started on a Sunday or on a Monday, then the images of Rudra (for Sunday) and Pārvatī (for Monday) were to be made of gold or silver and the mantras to be recited were respectively 'yā te Rudra' (Tai. S. IV. 5. 1. 1), 'gaurīr-mimāya' (Ṛg. I. 164. 41). The *gandha*, flowers, incense, lamp and *naivedya* were different in each case. If the fever starts on any one of the 27 nakṣatras, the Madanaratna (folios 12b–15b) prescribes śāntis for all the 27 nakṣatras, specifying the deity of each nakṣatra, the figure of the deity, its colour, mantra, the five upacāras from *gandha*, the kinds of fuel-sticks to be employed, the *āhutis*, the gifts &c. If the mantra[1276] be not known, the

---

1275. यस्य राशिं समासाद्य भवेद्ग्रहणसम्भवः। तस्य स्नानं प्रवक्ष्यामि मन्त्रौषधिसमन्वितम्॥ मत्स्य q. by कृत्यकल्प° (on शान्ति folio 21b), हे. (on व्रत, vol. II. p. 1021), नि. सि. p. 69 and शान्तिकमलाकर folio 157 b. अ. सा. pp. 87-90 and नि. सि. p. 69 quote this and about 25 verses more from मत्स्य on this.

1276. The mantras prescribed for religious worship and rites have a certain pattern, that is, they either refer to the rite to be performed and the deity or to the benefit prayed for or there is some word therein that indicates an application of it to the deity. For example, the mantra 'जातवेदसे सुनवाम' (Ṛg I. 99. 1) is employed for invoking the presence of Durgā, because therein occurs the word 'durgāṇi' (स नः पर्षदति दुर्गाणि विश्वा) or the verse 'Gaurīr-

(*Continued on next page*)

Gāyatrī mantra (Ṛg. III. 62. 10) was to be employed and the āhutis were to be 1008 or 108 according to the nature of the disease. The Madanratna (folios 15b–20b) quotes from Ātreya further details about the 27 nakṣatras, viz. the number of stars in each nakṣatra, whether a nakṣatra is masculine, feminine or neuter, its figure, colour, deity, tree, its *gaṇa*[1276a] (whether *devagaṇa* or rākṣasagaṇa or manuṣyagaṇa), what actions should be done on each, the Viṣanāḍī of each.

The Dharmasindhu provides a śānti for the extremely rare occurrence of a person coming to life after people thinking him to be dead take his body for cremation to a cemetery. The person in whose house such a person enters meets death. Therefore, a *homa* should be performed wherein eight thousand udumbara fuel-sticks anointed with milk and ghee are to be offered to the accompaniment of the Gāyatrī mantra (Ṛg. III. 62. 10). At the end of the homa a *kapilā* cow and a bronze vessel full of sesame should be donated to a brāhmaṇa; the bronze vessel should weigh 81 *palas* or $40\frac{1}{2}$ or $20\frac{1}{4}$ or 9, 6 or at least three palas according[1277] to one's means.

Some works prescribe a śānti on the delivery of a cow in the month of Bhādrapada, of a she-buffalo in Pauṣa and of a mare by day. The śānti is to be performed with 108 *āhutis* of ghee and sesame, the Asyavāmīya hymn (Ṛg. I. 164) and the mantra 'tad-Viṣṇoḥ' (Ṛg. I. 22. 20) are to be recited. It was supposed that if a she-buffalo was delivered in Māgha and on a Wednesday, or a mare in Śrāvaṇa by day or a cow while the

---

(Continued from last page)

mimāya' (Ṛg. I. 164. 41) is said to be mantra for Pārvatī, the presiding deity of Monday, because the word 'Gaurīr' suggests Gaurī, which is a name of पार्वती. The requirement is stated in the following Brāhmaṇa passage 'एतद्वै यज्ञस्य समृद्धं यद्रूपसमृद्धं यत्कर्म क्रियमाणमृग्यजुर्वाभिवदति' (quoted in निरुक्त I. 16). It occurs in ऐतरेयब्राह्मण several times (e. g. ऐ. ब्रा. I. 4, which reads merely ऋगभिवदति).

1276a. For the gaṇas of the 27 nakṣatras, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 514–515.

1277. A pala = 4 karṣas, a karṣa = 16 māṣas and 80 ratis. Hence a pala was equal to 320 raktikās. Vide Manu VIII. 134 and 136 and Yāj. I. 363–365.

Sun is in the Lion sign, that portends death of the[1278] owner in six months. It may be stated that in the author's boyhood such śāntis, particularly in the case of she-buffaloes, were performed. The Adbhutasāgara provides that the śānti should be performed on the 4th, 9th, 12th or 14th tithi, as these are declared to be auspicious tithis for adbhuta-śānti.[1279]

In modern times the entrance into a newly built house is preceded on the same day or on a previous day by a śānti called Vāstuśānti [1280] or Vāstu-śamana (in Matsya 268. 3). It has been described at some length in H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 834–836. The description [1280a] there is based on Matsya, chapters 256 and 268. Vāstuśamana is also described in the Āśvalāyana gṛhya II. 9. 6–9, Pār. gṛ. III. 4. 5–18, Baud gṛ. III. 5 (which are certainly older than Matsya by several centuries), in Baudhāyana-gṛhyaśeṣa-sūtra I. 18, the Sāmavidhāna-brāhmaṇa III. 3. 5 and several medieval works. The Baud. Gṛ. S. S. calls it Gṛhaśānti and recommends that it be performed every month, every season or every year in the bright fortnight on an auspicious nakṣatra by one who desires prosperity in his house. It is therefore passed over here. The Āśv. gṛ is very brief. It says [1281]: Then

---

1278. गर्ग उवाच। दिवा प्रसूता वडवा श्रावणे च विशेषतः। माघमासे बुधे चैव प्रसवे महिषी यदि। शान्तिकमलाकर folio 180; भानौ सिंहगते चैव यस्य गौः संप्रसूयते। मरणं तस्य निर्दिष्टं षड्भिर्मासैर्न संशयः॥ तस्य शान्तिं प्रवक्ष्यामि येन सम्पद्यते शुभम्। नारद q. by अ. सा. p. 568.

1279. चतुर्थी चाष्टमी चैव द्वादशी च चतुर्दशी। एता वै तिथयः पुण्याः स्मृता अद्भुतशान्तये। नारद q. by अ. सा. p. 568.

1280. Vāstu (n. in the Ṛgveda) means a house. Compare 'tā vām vāstūnyuśmasi gamadhyai' (Ṛg. I. 154. 6). It is derived from 'vas' (to reside). Vide Nirukta X. 17, where Ṛg. VII. 55. 1 is explained. There is a deity in the Ṛgveda called 'Vāstoṣpati' (lord of the house). वास्तोष्पति is either (as in Ṛg. VIII. 17. 14) Indra or Rudra (as Durga says). The śānti is performed for averting all evil after entering a newly built house.

1280 a. The सङ्कल्प in modern Vāstuśānti would be somewhat like the following: अमुकगोत्रस्यामुकशर्मणो मम सपरिवारस्यास्मिन्वास्तौ चिरकालसुखनिवासपूर्वमखिलरोगविघ्नादिशान्ति-सम्पदारोग्यपुत्रपौत्रधनधान्यादिसमृद्धि-चिरजीवन-स्वनिवाससिद्धिद्वारा श्रीपरमेश्वरप्रीत्यर्थमस्य वास्तोः शुभतासिद्ध्यर्थं सग्रहमखां वास्तुशान्तिं करिष्ये। तदङ्गतया गणेशपूजा-स्वस्तिवाचनमातृकापूजाभ्युदयिकश्राद्धाचार्य-ऋत्विग्वरणानि च करिष्ये।

1281. अथैनच्छमयति। व्रीहियवमतीभिरद्भिर्हिरण्यमवधाय शन्तातीयेन त्रिः प्रदक्षिणं परिव्रजन् प्रोक्षति। अविच्छिन्नया चोदकधारया आपो हि ष्ठा मयोभुव इति तृचेन। मध्येऽगारस्य स्थालीपाकं श्रपयित्वा वास्तोष्पते प्रतिजानीह्यस्मानिति चतसृभिः प्रत्यृचं हुत्वान्नं संस्कृत्य ब्राह्मणान्भोजयित्वा शिवं वास्तु वास्त्विति वाचयीत। आश्व. गृ. II. 9. 6–9. ऋ. VII. 35 (1–15) is called शन्तातीय because the word शं occurs in each of the first thirteen verses several times.

he makes the house śānta (as follows). He deposits gold in water that has rice and barley thrown into it, he sprinkles the house three times going round it with his right side turned towards it with the śantātīya hymn (Ṛg. VII. 35) and he does so again three times pouring out an unbroken stream of water with the three verses 'O waters! you are wholesome' (Ṛg. X. 9. 1–3). In the middle of the house he cooks boiled rice, offers from it four oblations with each of the four verses 'Vāstoṣpate pratijānīhyasmān' (Ṛg. VII. 54. 1–3 and VII. 55. 1), should then prepare food, should feed the brāhmaṇas with it and make them say 'lucky is the house, lucky is the house.' Some details from Baud. Gṛ. (III. 5) may be mentioned here. It provides that oblations are offered from cooked food with the invitatory prayer (Puronuvākyā) 'Vāstoṣpate pratijānīhi' ('O Lord of houses! accept us as your devotees,' (Ṛg. VII. 54. 1, Tai. S. III. 4. 10. 1) and the offering prayer (Yājyā) with 'Vāstoṣpate śagmayā' (O Lord of houses, may we be endowed with fellowship with thee &c.' Ṛg. VII. 54. 3, Tai. S. III. 4. 10. 1). Then he offers *āhutis* of clarified butter with the mantras viz. 'Vāstoṣpate dhruvā sthūṇā' (Ṛg. VIII. 17, 14), 'gṛhyam bhayam yac-ced',[1282] 'akṣispande-aṅgacale,' 'duḥ-svapne pāpasvapne', 'Vāstoṣpate prataraṇo' (O Vāstoṣpati! mayst thou be our saviour', Ṛg. VII. 54. 2), 'amīvahā Vāstoṣpate' (O Vāstoṣpati! Mayst thou be our friend destroying diseases' Ṛg. VII. 55. 1). Then he places the remainder of the food from which offerings were made on bunches of darbhas in front of the Fire with the words 'salutation to Rudra Vāstoṣpati! I offer (oblations to him) who protects when we approach, or run, walk out, depart, turn round or return.' Having brought together in a plate the water for cleansing the cooking vessel, the remainder of the clarified butter and the water (used in the rite) he sprinkles water therefrom on all sides with a twig of udumbara or palāśa or śamī tree or with a handful of darbhas, he goes round the house thrice with his right side towards it with the verse 'tvam vipraḥ' (Ṛg. IX. 18. 2). He prepares food, honours the brāhmaṇas (with food and fees), makes them recite blessings in the words 'lucky is the house, lucky is the house'.

In the later digests the Vāstuśānti is a very elaborate affair which is passed over here for reasons of space.

1282. I was not able to trace the three verses cited in the Baud. Gṛ. III, 5 viz. 'गृह्यं भयं यच्चेद् द्विपात्सु यत्तु चेच्चतुष्पात्सु &c.', 'अक्षिस्पन्देऽङ्गचले च यन्मयं यच्चाशिते यत्तु चेद्भुक्तके', 'दुःस्वप्ने पापस्वप्ने च यन्मयं &c.'.

Various prognostications were based on the sounds produced by the house lizard (called *pallī*, *pallikā*, *kuḍyamatsya* or *gṛhagodhikā*), by its movements and by its fall on the several limbs of a person by Vasantarāja śākuna, chap. 17 (32 verses), the Adbhutasāgara pp. 666-668 (quoting 28 verses of Vasantarāja), Jyotistattva pp. 706-707, Śāntiratna or Śānti-kamalākara (folio 198), the Dharmasindhu (pp. 347-348). A few words based on the last two are set out here. A fall of the lizard on the right side of a male and on his head (except the chin), chest, navel and stomach is auspicious, while in the case of a woman such a fall would be auspicious on the left side. The same applies to a chameleon. If a lizard or chameleon falls on a limb or creeps up a person's limb the person should take a bath with clothes on and perform a śānti for removal of the inauspiciousness or for increase of auspiciousness. If a person has a mere contact with a house lizard or chameleon he should bathe, drink *pañcagavya*, look into clarified butter, should pay honour to (a golden image of) the lizard or chameleon clothed in a red piece of cloth, offer to the image *gandha* and flowers, worship Rudra in a jar full of water, offer into fire 108 fuel sticks of *khadira* tree to the accompaniment of the Mṛtyuñjaya[1282a] mantra and offer 1008 or 108 *āhutis* of sesame into fire with the *vyāhṛtis* and perform the rites from *sviṣṭakṛt* to sprinkling with drops of water and then donate gold, clothes and sesame.[1282b]

The Yogayātrā chap. 7 (verses 1-12) and Hemādri on Vrata (vol. II. pp. 894-897) mention ceremonial baths on and worship of nakṣatras from Aśvinī to Revatī and their presiding deities as yielding various benefits. The Ātharvaṇa-pariśiṣṭa I (called nakṣatrakalpa) sections 37-50 deal with *nakṣatrasnāna* from Kṛttikā to Bharaṇī. Sections 37-41 contain the mantras employed in worshipping and placating the presiding deities of the nakṣatras beginning with Kṛttikā. Section 42 describes the general procedure of nakṣatrasnāna; sections 43-45 set out

---

1282a. Mṛtyuñjaya mantra is the Tryambaka mantra, according to Vidyākara quoted in Jyotistattva (p. 707). The Tryambaka mantra is 'Tryambakaṁ yajāmahe' (Ṛg. VII. 59. 12, Tai. S. I. 8. 6. 2, Vāj. S. III, 60).

1282b. It is somewhat remarkable that Vasantarāja is entirely silent about the fall of the house lizard on a person's body and devotes thirty-two verses merely to the interpretation of the sounds of the lizard in different directions and at different times of the day and to the prognostications derived from its movements on the walls. It is not unlikely that prognostication from the fall of the lizard on a man's limb was a later development.

the substances to be added to the water for each nakṣatrasnāna and the benefit to be derived from so doing. Sections 47–50 contain special rules in relation to each nakṣatra from Kṛttikā to Bharaṇī, about the distribution of food to brāhmaṇas and gifts to be made on each nakṣatra together with the rewards to be expected therefrom. But the Bṛhatsaṁhitā chap. 47 (1–87), the Ātharvaṇa-pariśiṣṭa V pp. 66–68, Viṣṇudharmottara II. 103, Yogayātrā (VII. 13–21), the Kālikāpurāṇa chap. 89, and Hemādri (on Vrata vol. II. pp. 600–628) speak of a śānti called *Puṣyasnāna or Puṣyābhiṣeka. It is said that Bṛhaspati* performed this śānti for Indra, then Vṛddha-Garga got it and he imparted it to Bhāguri. Most of the above works confine it to the king, since the king is the very root of the tree—the subjects—and since any harm to or welfare of that root (the king) results in misfortune or welfare of the people; therefore care must be taken for the increase of the king's welfare.[1283] As the treatment in the Bṛhatsaṁhitā is the fullest and is among the most ancient descriptions, it is briefly set out here. The royal astrologer and family priest should perform the rite of Puṣyasnāna for the king, than which there is nothing more holy and nothing more destructive of all evil portents. This may be performed on puṣya-nakṣatra every time, but the Śānti on this day when the Full Moon is in Puṣya-nakṣatra is the highest and if such a *snāna* is performed without there being Puṣya nakṣatra on that day, then it yields only half the fruit. There is no utpāta which is not averted or mitigated by this śānti and there is no other auspicious rite which surpasses this. About Puṣya the Ratnamālā[1284] states 'Just as the lion is the strongest among

---

1283. मूलं मनुजाधिपतिः प्रजातरोस्तदुपघातसंस्कारात्। अशुभं शुभं च लोके भवति यतोऽतो नृपतिचिन्ता॥ या व्याख्याता शान्तिः स्वयम्भुवा सुरगुरोर्महेन्द्रार्थे। तां प्राप्य वृद्धगर्गः प्राह यथा भागुरेः शृणुत॥ पुष्यस्नानं नृपतेः कर्तव्यं दैववित्पुरोधोभ्याम्। नातः परं पवित्रं सर्वोत्पातान्तकरमस्ति॥ ...एतत्प्रयुज्यमानं प्रतिपुष्यं सुखयशोऽर्थवृद्धिकरम्। पुष्याद्विनार्धफलदा पौषी शान्तिः परा प्रोक्ता॥ नास्ति लोके स उत्पातो यो ह्यनेन न शाम्यति। मङ्गलं चापरं नास्ति यदस्मादतिरिच्यते॥ बृहत्सं. 47. 1–3 and 82, 84; vide विष्णुधर्मोत्तर II. 103. 31–32 for the story about Indra and Bṛhaspati. मत्स्य says 'प्रजातरोर्मूलमिहावनीशस्तद्रक्षणाद्राष्ट्रमुपैति वृद्धिम्।' (219. 34) q. by कल्पतरु (on राजधर्मकाण्ड).

1284. सिंहो यथा सर्वचतुष्पदानां तथैव पुष्यो बलवानुडूनाम्। चन्द्रे विरुद्धेऽप्यथ गोचरे वा सिध्यन्ति कार्याणि कृतानि पुष्ये॥ रत्नमाला VI. 70. According to बृहत्संहिता 103. 2 if the moon is in the 1st, 3rd, 6th, 7th, 10th or 11th rāśi from the rāśi of birth it is auspicious and it is inauspicious in the other rāśis from birth. 'सूर्यः षट्त्रिदशस्थितस्त्रिदशषट्सप्ताद्यगश्चन्द्रमाः ...सर्वेऽप्युपान्त्ये शुभाः &c.' Vide note 876a and p. 589 above for गोचरचन्द्र and other ग्रह and बृहत्सं. 103. 8–10 for the *phalas* of the moon being in the rāśi of birth or in the rāśis from the 1st to the 12th.

all quadrupeds, so is Puṣya the most powerful among nakṣatras; undertakings begun on Puṣya succeed even if the Moon be unfavourable or be *gocara*. Then Varāhamihira states in very poetic verses (47. 4–15) that the Puṣyasnāna of the king should be performed in a sylvan spot abounding in young and beautiful trees emitting fragrance and free from trees having thorns or trees like marking nut or from owls, vultures and the like or on rivers or on lakes or near lotus pools or near a cow-house or seashore or hermitages of sages, grand mansions resounding with the sweet cries of cuckoos and the like or near a holy shrine or tīrtha or a spot beautified by parks. Then the astrologer, the councillors and officiating priests should go out from the capital at night and make an offering (*bali*) in the East, North or North-east and the royal family priest, being himself pure and bowing down, should invoke with fried grains, akṣata, barley, curds and flowers and with a mantra[1285] the gods, the (guardians of) quarters, the *nāgas* and brāhmaṇas to be present at the spot and then say 'tomorrow you will receive worship and depart after conferring welfare on the king'. The family priest and the others should stay in order to find the auspicious nature or otherwise of the dreams (of the king). On the next day in the morning they should collect materials (for the Puṣyasnāna) on the spot chosen the previous day. He should draw a maṇḍala (a diagram) there and should place thereon various jewels and should assign places to nāgas, yakṣas, gods, pitṛs, gandharvas, apsarases, sages, siddhas, planets, nakṣatras, Rudras, the mātṛs, Skanda, Viṣṇu, Viśākha, Lokapālas, goddesses (such as Lakṣmī, Gaurī, Indrāṇī), which should all be drawn with charming coloured powders or chalk &c., should offer them worship with sandal wood paste, flowers &c., with various edibles, fruits and meat, with drinks viz. wine, milk and decoctions; he should follow the procedure of Grahayajña and worship the various deities invited with appropriate foods, incense, clarified butter, flowers, with lauds and salutations &c. (verses 30–33). Then he should set up Agni on an altar to the west or south of the maṇḍala drawn by him, should kindle it into flames and bring near it the materials and darbhas. He should offer worship on the altar to the west with fried grams, ghee, curds, honey, white mustard, fragrant substances, flowers, incense, fruits, and should donate plates full of *pāyasa* and ghee. Then in the four inter-

---

1285. The mantra for invoking the gods is आगच्छन्तु सुराः सर्वे येऽत्र पूजाभिलाषिणः । दिशो नागा द्विजाश्चैव ये चाप्यन्येंऽशभागिनः ॥ बृहत्सं. 47. 20.

mediate quarters of the altar he should establish four jars the necks of which are surrounded with white thread and that are covered with leaves, twigs and fruits of trees having milky sap and filled with water mixed with herbs and materials for puṣyasnāna and jewels. In verses 39–42 Varāhamihira names about 15 plants the leaves[1286] of which are to be cast in the jars and also seeds and *sarvauṣadhis*, sarvagandhas, bilva fruit &c. He should spread an old bull's hide with its neck to the east on the altar and thereon he should spread the reddish hide of a bull trained for fighting, the hides of a lion and a tiger one over the other, when the Moon is in Puṣya-nakṣatra and there is an auspicious *muhūrta* Over the hides a throne made of gold, silver, copper or of a tree with a milky sap should be placed. The king should occupy the throne after placing thereon a piece of gold, surrounded by his ministers, men of his confidence, the family priest, the astrologer, the citizens that have auspicious names (such or Jayarāja, Siṁharāja &c.).

There should be loud noises (for drowning inauspicious sounds) made by the bards and citizens and of the tabors and drums and of Vedic recitations. The king should wear linen and the *purohita* should cover the king with a blanket, drops should be sprinkled over the king from jars, 3, 28 or 108 in number, containing clarified butter, with two mantras[1287] praising its power to remove evil and then the priest removes the blanket and sprinkles on the king drops of water from water containing the substances collected for puṣyasnāna with sixteen mantras[1288]

1286. Several of the 15 plants mentioned in the Bṛ. S. occur also in आथर्वणपरिशिष्ट V. 1–5. 2. 2. In the मत्स्यपुराण eight plants are mentioned as महौषध्यष्टक (viz. सहदेवी, वचा, व्याघ्री, बला, अतिबला, शङ्खपुष्पी, सिंही, सुवर्चला) that are to be employed in general for the *snapana* of all gods (chap. 267.14–15).

1287. आज्यं तेजः समुद्दिष्टमाज्यं पापहरं परम्। आज्यं सुराणामाहार आज्ये लोकाः प्रतिष्ठिताः॥ भौमान्तरिक्षं दिव्यं वा यत्ते कल्मषमागतम्। सर्वं तदाज्यसंस्पर्शात् प्रणाशमुपगच्छतु॥ बृहत्सं. 47. 52–53. These are quoted by हेमाद्रि (on व्रत vol. II. p. 615), but it is not clear from what work.

1288. It may be noted that Hemādri (on व्रत vol. II. p. 615) has the mantras of बृहत्सं. 47. 55–60 in the same order and (p. 616) has also the mantras (verses 67–70 first-half). Varāha first gives a long list (55–70) of Paurāṇika mantras and then (in verse 71) only mentions names of groups of mantras. इत्येतैरन्यैश्चाथर्वकल्पाभिहितैः सरुद्रगणैः। कौष्माण्डमहारौहिणकुबेरहृद्यैः ससूक्तैश्च॥ बृहत्सं. 47.71. The मत्स्यपुराण has verses (93. 51–56) similar to those of वराह's पौराणिक mantras.

(set out by Varāha in verses 55–70) in which gods, goddesses, sages are invited to join in the rite, besides mantras from the Atharvakalpa,[1289] the Rudragaṇa mantras, Kūṣmāṇḍa mantras, the Mahārauhiṇa, Kubera-hṛdaya and *Samṛddhi* verse. Then the king should take a bath and wear two cotton garments over which the three verses 'Āpo hi ṣṭhā' (Ṛg. X 9. 1–3, Tai. S. IV. 1. 5. 1) and the four verses 'Hiraṇyavarṇāḥ' (Tai. S. V. 6. 1. 1–2, or Atharva I. 33. 1–4) have been inaudibly recited. He should sip water to the accompaniment of words like 'this is a lucky day' and to the sound of conches, should worship gods, gurus, brāhmaṇas, his parasol, banner, and weapons and then worship his special (or favourite) deity. Then he should put on new decorations that lead to victory, that confer long life and vigour and over which the Rāyaspoṣa[1290] (bestowing increase of wealth) ṛk verses have been recited. To the south of the maṇḍala an altar should be prepared and hides of bull, cat, *ruru* deer, spotted antelope, lion and tiger should be arranged one over the other (tiger's being last) and the king should sit down on the hides. The purohita should offer in the fire in the principal place (to the south) offerings of fuel-sticks, sesame, ghee and the like to the accompaniment of ṛk verses addressed to Rudra, Indra, Bṛhaspati, Viṣṇu and Vāyu. The astrologer should observe and

---

1289. The Atharvaṇa-pariśiṣṭa V. 3. 4–5 prescribes (p. 67) the opening passage of each Veda, the mahāvyāhṛtis (bhūḥ, bhuvaḥ, svaḥ) and five gaṇas as accompanying the offerings into fire, viz. 'शर्मवर्मागणश्चैव तथा स्यादपराजितः । आयुष्यश्चाभयश्चैव तथा स्वस्त्ययनो गणः ॥ एतान् पञ्च गणान् हुत्वा वाचयेत द्विजोत्तमान् ।'. For शर्मवर्मागण vide आथर्वणपरि. XXXII 14 p. 196 containing 22 verses, the first of which is शर्मवर्मा, that is अथर्व. 14. 2. 21. The अपराजितगण contains 15 verses beginning with 'aparājito' (vide आथर्वणपरिशिष्ट 32. 13); the आयुष्यगण has 14 verses of the अथर्ववेद (in आ. परि. XXXII 9. p. 195); for two अभयगणs, vide आ. परि. XXXII. 12 and 29; for स्वस्त्ययनगण vide आ. परि. XXXII. 11. रुद्रगण is आ. परि. XXXII. 16 or it may be Rudras in Tai. S. IV. 5. 1–11. The कूष्माण्ड mantras are Vāj. S. 20 14–16 and Tai. Ā. II. 3. 1, II. 4. 1 (beginning with 'yad-devā devaheḍanam'). Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. p. 43 for Kuṣmāṇḍahoma. For Rauhiṇa-sāman vide H. of Dh. IV. p. 46 n. The Kubera-hṛdaya is probably the mantra in Tai. Ā. I. 31. 6 (Rājādhirājāya...mahārājāya namaḥ). It is not known which ṛk is called Samṛddhi.

1290. There are many verses of the Ṛgveda cited in the Taittirīya-saṁhitā which contain the word 'rāyaspoṣa', but as Utpala in his commentary says that the verses are six, it is probable that the verses meant are (Ṛg. X. 17. 9–14), the first of which ends with the words 'rāyaspoṣaṁ yajamāneṣu dhehi'.

declare the prognostications derived[1290a] from the flames of the sacred Agni as laid down in the chapter on the festival of Indra's banner (Bṛ. S. 42. 31–36). Then the purohita with folded hands should pray[1291] 'May all the groups of gods receive the worship from the king and depart after conferring (on him) abundant prosperity and returning (when again invoked)'. Then the king should honour the astrologer and the purohita with plenty of wealth and (honour) according to their deserts also others, viz. men learned in the Veda and the like who are well worthy of receiving gifts. Then the king should assure safety to all subjects, (order the) release of all animals taken to slaughter houses and release all persons put in jail except those guilty of offences against the king's person or his harem. Varāhamihira adds (47. 85) that this procedure of Puṣyasnāna is commended for a king who aspires after imperial dignity or who ardently desires a son or when he is first crowned king. He further states that this very procedure of ceremonial bath should be employed in the case of the king's elephants and horses that then become free from diseases (verse 87).

A few remarks from other works may be added here. The Yoga-yātrā (chap. VII. 13–14) lays down[1292] that in the ceremonial bath clay should be collected from a mountain top, ant-hill, a river mouth, the two banks of a river, the foot of the Indra figure (in the Indradhvaja festival), (clay) dug up by the tusk of an elephant and by a bull's horn, (clay) from the royal palace-door and from the door of the house of a dancing girl (patronized by the king) and the king's head should be purified by rubbing on it the clay from a mountain top, his ears with

---

1290 a. One verse from chap. 42 about the auspicious indications conveyed by Agni flaming up by itself (i. e. without being fanned etc.) at the end of the shout 'svāhā' (when pūrṇāhuti is offerred) and having its flames turned towards the right is cited here : स्वाहावसानसमये स्वयमुज्ज्वलार्चिः स्निग्धः प्रदक्षिणशिखो हुतभुग् नृपस्य । गङ्गादिवाकरसुताजलचारुहारां धात्रीं समुद्ररशनां वशगां करोति ॥ बृहत्सं. 42. 32; compare तस्मै सम्यग्घुतो वह्निर्वाजिनीराजनाविधौ । प्रदक्षिणार्चिर्व्याजेन हस्तेनेव जयं ददौ ॥ रघुवंश IV.25. In the योगयात्रा (chapter 8) fifteen verses are devoted to अग्निनिमित्त of which verses 11–15 are the same as बृहत्सं. 42.32–36.

1291. The prayer is well-known : यान्तु देवगणाः सर्वे पूजामादाय पार्थिवात् । सिद्धिं दत्त्वा तु विपुलां पुनरागमनाय च ॥ बृहत्सं. 47. 79.

1292. गिरिवल्मीकनदीमुखकूलद्वयशक्रपादमृद्भिरथः । द्विपवृषभविषाणपार्थिवगणिकाद्वाराद्धृताभिश्च ॥ गिरिशिखरमृदा मूर्धानं वल्मीकमृदा च शोधयेत्कर्णौ । नद्युभयकूलसङ्गमसृद्भिः प्रक्षालयेत्पार्श्वे ॥ इन्द्रस्थानाद् ग्रीवा बाहू करिवृषभयोर्विषाणाग्रात् । हृदयं च नृपद्वारात्कटिमपि वेश्यागृहद्वारात् ॥ योगयात्रा VII. 13–15.

clay from an ant-hill, his sides with clay from the two banks of a river and from its confluence with the sea, his neck with clay from the foot of the Indra figure, his arms with earth on the tip of the elephant's tusk and the bull's horns, his chest with earth from the door of the palace and his waist with clay from a royal courtezan's door. It will be noticed that there is a suggestive symbolism in all this. The king is to hold his head high and to attain eminence; therefore his head is to be rubbed with clay from a mountain peak.

It appears that nakṣatrasnāna was meant for all. For example, the Ātharvaṇa-pariśiṣṭa[1293] on nakṣatrakalpa (sec. 43 p. 22) states that a Vaiśya should undergo ceremonial bath on Rohiṇī, being decked with all seeds, while verse 6 of the same section maintains that a brāhmaṇa who undergoes Puṣyasnāna thrice with a thousand grains of red paddy and with a thousand mustard grains and with (twigs and leaves) of Sahasravīryā, Anantī plants and with Madayantī and Priyaṅgu plants acquires as much fame as a king.

From the Matsya-purāṇa it is clear[1294] that Puṣyasnāna was an item in Lakṣahoma, undertaken by the king to counteract the evil effects of planets. That Purāṇa has a chapter (267. verses 3-4) on Devatāsnāna[1295] where also provision is made for casting clay into the jar, clay being collected from the tusk of an elephant, from a horse (stable), public road, ant-hill, (clay) dug up by a boar (with its tusk), from the shed where sacred fire is kept, from a tīrtha (holy spot), cowpen and from the place where cows crowd.

The Viṣṇudharmottara (II. 103. 1-10) provides that Bārhaspatyasnāna (i. e. Puṣyasnāna, Bṛhaspati being the presiding deity of Puṣya) should be performed in the bright half, in the

---

1293. रोहिण्यां स्नापयेद्वैश्यं सर्वबीजैरलङ्कृतम्। ...रक्तशालिसहस्रेण सावन्निर्गौरसर्षपैः। सहस्रवीर्यानन्त्या च मदयन्ती-प्रियङ्गुभिः। त्रीन् पुष्यान् ब्राह्मणः स्नातः पार्थिवं लभते यशः॥ आ. परि. (नक्षत्रकल्प, sec 42 verses 3 and 6, p. 22).

1294. हुत्वा शतसहस्रं तु पुष्यस्नानं समाचरेत्। कुम्भैः षोडशसंख्यैश्च सहिरण्यैः सुमङ्गलैः॥ स्नापयेद्यजमानं तु ततः शान्तिर्भविष्यति। एवं कृते तु यत्किंचिद् ग्रहपीडासमुद्भवम्॥ तत्सर्वं नाशमायाति दत्त्वा वै दक्षिणां नृप॥ मत्स्य 239. 12-14 q. by कृत्यकल्प० (on शान्तिक) folio 12a.

1295. गजाश्वरथ्यावल्मीकवराहोत्खातमण्डलात्। अग्न्यगारात्तथा तीर्थाद् व्रजाद् गोमण्डलादपि। कुम्भे तु मृत्तिकां दद्याद् उद्धृतासीति मन्त्रवित्। मत्स्य 267. 3-4. The मन्त्र is: उद्धृतासि वराहेण कृष्णेन शतबाहुना। भूमिर्धेनुर्धरणी लोकधारिणी॥. It occurs in तैत्तिरीयारण्यक X. 1. 8.

northern passage of the sun, on an auspicious day, nakṣatra and muhūrta or when the moon is in Puṣya or Rohiṇī nakṣatra or in Hasta or Śravaṇa; two square maṇḍalas of eight cubits on each of four sides should be made, one for offering *bali* and the other for an altar on which a fire is to be established, both being decked with various things. Four jars with waters of springs should be placed in each of the two maṇḍalas, and also seven jars filled with seeds, corn and precious stones, one for being decked with leaves of trees and the other with flowers and fruits. It appears (verses 12–13) that the Viṣṇudharmottara contemplates Puṣyasnāna for the three higher varṇas,[1296] since it provides that a brāhmaṇa should sit on the hide of a bull as his seat, a kṣatriya may employ the hides of a lion and tiger and a vaiśya on the hides of a tiger and leopard. It provides mantras other than those mentioned by Varāhamihira. It provides that this rite of Puṣyasnāna should go on for seven days and that the person undergoing it should give up during those days wine, meat, honey and sexual intercourse (verse 29). This Puṣyasnāna drives away all ill-luck, destroys evil spirits, brightens the intellect, confers health, brilliance and fame, kills enemies, is auspicious, destroys sins and the evil effects of strife and bad dreams (verses 30–31).

It should be borne in mind that a rite on Puṣya for prosperity called Puṣya-vrata is mentioned by so early a work as the Āpastambadharma-sūtra (for which p. 346 above may be referred to).

In Bṛhadyogayātrā (chap. XIII. 1–10), Matsyapurāṇa (chap. 241. 1–14) and in Vasantarāja (chap. VI. 4. 1–14 pp. 87–92) a good deal is said about prognostications derived from the throbbing (*spandana* or *sphuraṇa*) of the several parts of a man's body. All the three often closely agree in words and ideas as the notes below will clearly show. There is hardly any doubt that Vasantarāja's treatment is based on the other two works. It is difficult to decide whether Varāhamihira borrows from the Matsya or *vice versa* or whether both borrow from a common source. It is not unlikely that Varāhamihira might

---

1296. विप्रस्य स्नातुकामस्य सौरमार्षभकं शुभम्। क्षत्रियस्य तथा सैंहं वैयाघ्रं च तथा विशः॥ द्वीपिचर्म च वैश्यस्य स्नाप्यस्तत्रोपवेशयत्। प्रशस्तलक्षणां भार्यां वामभागे तथैव च॥ विष्णुधर्मोत्तर *II. 103. 12–13. I am not sure what* सौर *means here; probably it* means (dedicated to the Sun or to gods).

have followed the Matsya. They all agree that throbbing[1297] of the right side of the body is auspicious and of the left inauspicious in the case of males, while the reverse is true in the case of women. They all set out the consequences indicated by the throbbing of the several parts and limbs of the body from the top of the head to the soles of the feet. To set out all these in detail would occupy much space. A few are mentioned by way of illustration. The fruit indicated by the throbbing of the top of the[1298] head is the acquisition of land (or earth); of the forehead, the prosperity of the position already occupied; of the region between the eyebrows and nose, union with persons dear to one; of the region of the eye, death; of the portion near the eye the acquisition ot wealth; of the upper arm, union with friends; of the hand, the acquisition of wealth; of the back, defeat; of the chest, success; of the upper part of the foot, the securing of a position; of the soles, journey with gain therein. The Matsya-purāṇa[1299] prescribes that when inauspicious indications (by throbbing) occur, brāhmaṇas should be placated with the gift of gold.

From ancient times the throbbing of the limbs, particularly of the arm and eye, have been regarded in India as the harbingers of coming events, auspicious or inauspicious. Manu prohibits a *sannyāsin* (*parivrājake*) from obtaining alms by means of declaring prognostications from utpātas or nimittas, from nakṣatras and from Aṅgavidyā etc. In the Śākuntala

---

1297. अङ्गदक्षिणभागे तु शस्तं मस्फुरणं भवेत्। अप्रशस्तं तथा वामे पृष्ठस्य हृदयस्य च॥ ...विपर्ययेण विहितः सर्वः स्त्रीणां फलागमः। मत्स्य 241. 2 and 12: दक्षिणपार्श्वस्पन्दनमभिधास्ये तत्फलक्षयो वामे। बृहद्योग॰ XIII. 1; पुंसां सदा दक्षिणदेहभागे स्त्रीणां च वामावयवेषु लाभः। स्पन्दाः फलानि प्रदिशन्त्यवश्यं निहन्ति चोक्ताङ्गविपर्ययेण॥ वसन्तराज VI. 4. 10, p. 90.

1298. पृथ्वीलाभो भवेन्मूर्ध्नि ललाटे रविनन्दन। स्थानं विवृद्धिमायाति भ्रूनसोः प्रियसङ्गमः॥ भृत्युलब्धिश्चाक्षदेशे दृगुपान्ते धनागमः। ...सुहृत्स्नेहश्च बाहुभ्यां हस्ते चैव धनागमः। पृष्ठे पराजयः सद्यो जयो वक्षःस्थले भवेत्। ...उत्तमं स्थानमाप्नोति पद्भ्यां प्रस्फुरणान्नृप। सलाभं चाध्वगमनं भवेत्पादतले नृप॥ मत्स्य 241. 4–5, 8; compare बृहद्योग॰ XIII. 1, 2, 4, 5, 9 पृथ्वीलाभः शिरसि स्थानविवृद्धिर्ललाटेसात् (? ललाटदेशे स्यात्)। भ्रूनासिकान्तरे प्रियसमागमो भृत्युलब्धिरक्षिणसोः। दृगुपान्तेऽर्थाप्तिः पूर्वं ज्ञेयात्र चोत्कण्ठा॥ ...अंसे भोगविवृद्धिर्भ्रूनस इष्टेन संयोगः॥ हस्तेर्थाप्तिः पृष्ठे पराजयो वक्षसि :स्मृतो विजयः। ...देशैकदेशनाशो अङ्गयां स्थानलब्धिरङ्घ्र्युपरि। अध्वगमनं सलाभं चरणतले स्पन्दमाने तु॥ मूर्ध्नि स्फुरत्याशु पृथिव्यवाप्तिः स्थानप्रवृद्धिश्च ललाटदेशात्। भ्रू-घ्राणमध्ये प्रियसङ्गमः स्यान्नासाक्षिमध्ये च सहायलाभः॥ स्पन्दो भुजस्येष्टसमागमाय स्पन्दः करस्य द्रविणाप्तिहेतुः। स्पन्दश्च पृष्ठस्य पराजयाय स्पन्दो जयायोरसि मानवानाम्॥. ...स्थानाप्तिरूर्ध्वं चरणस्य कम्पे यात्रा सलाभाङ्घ्रितलप्रकम्पे॥ वसन्तराज VI. 4. 2, 5, 9 pp. 87–90.

1299. अनिष्टचिह्नोपगमे द्विजानां कार्यं सुवर्णेन तु तर्पणं स्यात्। मत्स्य 241. 14.

Kālidāsa twice mentions the throbbing of the arm of the hero as indicative of good fortune and the throbbing of the right eye of Śakuntalā as presaging[1300] misfortune. Shakespeare in "Othello" makes Desdemona speak about the itching of her eyes as a bad omen. The Bṛhad-yogayātrā (XIII. 10), Bṛ. S. (51.10) and Vasantarāja declare that the throbbing of moles, boils, marks, eruptions (on limbs) are to be deemed to indicate consequences similar to the limbs on which they exist.[1301]

The Bṛhatsaṁhitā (chap 93 verses 1–14), Bṛhadyogayātrā (chap. 21 verses[1302] 1–21) and Yogayātrā (chap. 10 verses 1–75) dwell at length on the prognostications to be drawn from the arrangement of the tusks of elephants, from the marks seen when the tusks are cut, from the tired appearance and movements of elephants, particularly when the king is to march on an invasion, since as the Yogayātrā says the king's victory depends on elephants.[1303] These, however, do not describe any śānti and are hence passed over here as not relevant to the subject of śāntis. But the Agnipurāṇa (chap. 291 verses 1–24), Viṣṇudharmottara (II. 50. 1–93), Baud. gṛhyaśeṣasūtra I. 20 and Hemādri (on Vrata, vol. II. pp. 1036–1051) prescribe śāntis for removing diseases of elephants and therefore a brief note is added here from Baud. gṛhyaśesa-sūtra, which is probably the earliest and simplest description of a Gajaśānti.

"On the 8th or 11th or 14th tithi of the bright half of a month or on Śravaṇa nakṣatra, the owner should feed brāhmaṇas,

---

1300. Vide मनु VI. 50 न चोत्पातनिमित्ताभ्यां न नक्षत्राङ्गविद्यया। नानुशासनवादाभ्यां भिक्षां लिप्सेत कर्हिचित्॥. The commentators give different explanations of अङ्गविद्या. Probably it means सामुद्रिक or lore about the indications from the throbbing of the several limbs. A work Called Aṅgavijjā edited by Muni Puṇyavijayaji is published by the Prakrit Text Society at Banaras. It speaks of eight kinds of निमित्त viz. अङ्ग, स्वप्न, लक्षण, व्यञ्जन, स्वर, छिन्न, भौम and आन्तरिक्ष. For कालिदास, vide शान्तमिदमाश्रमपदं स्फुरति च बाहुः कुतः फलमिहास्य। शाकुन्तल I. 11; मनोरथाय नाशंसे किं बाहो स्पन्दसे वृथा। शाकुन्तल VII. 13; शाकुन्तल। —अहो किं मे वामेतरनयनं विस्फुरति। शाकुन्तल Act V after verse 11.

1301. इति पिटकविभागः प्रोक्त आ मूर्धतोऽयं व्रणतिलकविभागोऽप्येवमेव प्रकल्प्यः। भवति मशकलक्ष्मावर्तजन्मापि तद्वन्निगदितफलकारि प्राणिनां देहसंस्थम्। बृहत्सं. 51. 10; मशकं तिलकं पिटकं वापि व्रणमथ चिह्नं किमपि कदापि। स्फुरति पदान्यधितिष्ठति यावत्स्यात् पूर्वोक्तं फलमपि तावत्॥ वसन्तराज VI. 4. 11, p. 91.

1302. Verses 8–13 of the Bṛ. S. 93 are the same as the verses of Bṛhadyogayātrā 21. 9–14.

1303. आरिराधयिषुर्नराधिपं वारणाश्रितमिदं शुभाशुभम्। ज्ञेयमादरवतो विपश्चिता वारणेषु नृपतेर्जयः स्थितः॥ योगयात्रा X. 1.

make them declare 'it is an auspicious day, let there be welfare, let there be prosperity,' should first (or 'towards the east') take out for offering *havis* sesame and rice grains, bring water after repeating the Gāyatrī verse (Ṛg. III. 62. 10), should cover two jars with a new piece of cloth with the Gāyatrī, should close the mouths of the jars with some fruit (a cocoanut or the like) and keep the boiled food towards the west and place (the two jars) on a bunch of five dūrvās. Then after the elephant stable is decked with wreaths of darbhas the elephant inhales the smell of the food offered in fire. He then makes ready a spoon of Aśvattha wood and fuel and darbha grass. Then he goes through the items of ordinary *homa* [1304] from drawing lines onwards and offers oblations of the boiled food with ghee to the accompaniment of the Ghṛtasūkta [1305] (Ṛg. VIII. 81. 1–9). Then (the priest) offers 1008 additional *āhutis* with clarified butter with the five mantras beginning with 'namas-te Rudra manyave' (O Rudra! adoration to you that are fury incarnate' Tai. S. IV. 5. 1. 1–5). Then the procedure from Sviṣṭakṛt offering to the gift of the cow (should be gone through). He puts down on bunches of *dūrvā* grass the remaining portion of the food from which offerings were made in front of the sacred Agni with the words 'svāhā to the *bhūtas*' (spirits). Then he (priest) makes (the elephant) eat what remains of the food cooked in the *sthālī* (pan or cooking vessel) and the bunch of five dūrvās (on which the jars had been placed) to the accompaniment of the Āyuṣya-sūkta; [1306] he sprinkles drops from the praṇītā [1307] water with the

---

1304. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 207–211 for the description of a model *homa*.

1305. It may be noted that the first verse of the Ghṛtasūkta is 'आ तू न इन्द्र क्षुमन्तं चित्रं ग्राभं सं गृभाय। महाहस्ती दक्षिणेन ॥'. Here the word महाहस्ती means 'great elephant' and also 'having long or big arms' (as applied to Indra) and therefore is employed in the Gajaśānti, following the principle mentioned in note 1276 above. Vide n. 1218 above about घृतसूक्त.

1306. The आयुष्यसूक्त is the खिलसूक्त 'आयुष्यं वर्चस्यं' occurring after Ṛg. X. 128. The आथर्वणपरिशिष्ट 32. 9 p. 195 declares what the आयुष्यगण contains (from Atharvaveda). The कौशिकसूत्र 52. 18 says that Atharva I. 30. 1–4 are आयुष्याणि (conferring long life). Vide तात्पर्यदर्शन on आप. गृ. V. 12. 9 which regards the (first) eight verses of the खिलसूक्त 'आयुष्यं वर्चस्यं' as constituting आयुष्यसूक्त. The com. of Nārāyaṇa on आश्व. गृ. III. 8. 16 (आयुष्यमिति सूक्तेन मणिं कण्ठे प्रतिमुच्य &c.) says that आयुष्यसूक्त here is the खिलसूक्त (of three verses) beginning with नेजमेष after Ṛg. X. 184.

1307. प्रणीता is water kept in a vessel to the north of the fire after repeating a mantra over it.

three verses beginning with 'āpo hi ṣṭhā' (Rg. X. 9. 1–3, Tai. S. IV. 1. 3. 1–3) and the four verses beginning with 'Hiraṇyavarṇāḥ' (Tai. S. V. 6. 1. 1–4), purifies (*the elephant with water*) to the accompaniment of the anuvāka beginning with 'pavamānaḥ suvarjanaḥ' (Tai. Br. I. 4. 8. 1); he then leads the elephant to its place (stable); the elephant becomes long-lived; so says the adorable Baudhāyana."

The Gajaśānti in Agnipurāṇa (chap. 291) is entirely different from the above. One should worship on the 5th tithi of the bright half Viṣṇu, Lakṣmī, the Airāvata[1308] elephant and the other elephants (in all eight) and Brahmā, Śaṅkara, Indra, Kubera, Yama, the Sun and the Moon, Varuṇa, Vāyu, Agni, the Earth and Ākāśa. The elephants should be sprinkled with *śāntyudaka* (propitiatory water). The Agnipurāṇa proposes an elaborate worship, on a lotus-shaped diagram drawn on an altar, of several gods, several weapons, sages, rivers and mountains &c., elephants &c. and provides that an astrologer should ride the principal elephant of the king and say into its ear 'you are made the chief of elephants, the king will honour you with *gandha*, flowers, best food and people at the order of the king will honour you; you should protect the king in battle, in his journey and in his palace. You should forget that you are a mere beast and revolve in your mind that you are divine!' &c. The king should then ride such an elephant and armed warriors should follow and various gifts should be made to the elephant keeper, the astrologer, the ācārya &c.

The Viṣṇudharmottara (II. 50. 1–93) is far more elaborate than even the Agnipurāṇa. Its verses about the words to be muttered in the ear of the elephant (II. 50. 59–64) are the same as those in the Agni (291, 15–20). The Viṣṇudharmottara adds (II. 50. 68–70) that this śānti should not be performed on the 4th, 9th or 14th tithi nor on Tuesday nor on Saturday and the commended nakṣatras are Jyeṣṭhā, Citrā and Śravaṇa and that *this śānti rite for elephants destroys all danger to elephants.*

Hemādri (on Vrata vol. II. pp. 1036–1051) contains a long Gajaśānti said to have been declared by Pālakāpya. Many of

---

1308. According to the Amarakośa, the eight elephants of the quarters are Airāvata, Puṇḍarīka, Vāmana, Kumuda, Añjana, Puṣpadanta, Sārvabhauma and Supratīka. Vide Udyogaparva 103. 9–16 and Droṇaparva 121. 25–26 for the numerous progeny of these semi-divine elephants. The Viṣṇudharmottara (II. 50. 10–11) names eight *diggajas*, but drops Sārvabhauma from the Amarakośa list and substitutes Nīla.

those verses occur in the Hastyāyurveda (Ānandāśrama ed.) chapters 35 and 36. Considerations of space and of importance prevent any description of that śānti derived from the Hastyāyurveda.

The Bṛhatsaṁhitā (chap. 92. 1-14), the Bṛhadyogayātrā (22. 1-21) and the Yogayātrā (XI. 1-14) deal with the movements, neighing, prancing, striking the ground with hoofs, postures of horses from which lucky or unlucky consequences are to be inferred. But they do not describe any śānti and therefore are passed over. The Agnipurāṇa (chap. 290, 1-8), the Viṣṇudharmottara (II. 47. 1-42), Baud. gṛhyśeṣasūtra I. 19 and Hemādri (on vrata, vol. II. pp. 1031-36 taken from Śālihotra) describe a śānti which averts all dangers to horses and removes their diseases.

The śānti from Baudhāyana is as follows:— "having carried out the usual details of an ordinary *homa* from drawing the lines onwards (the priest) offers into Agni oblations from the cooked food after reciting the puronuvākyā (invitatory prayer) 'tadaśvināśvayujopayātām' (May the Aśvins that yoke horses come near, Tai. Br. III. 1. 2. 10) and the yājyā (offering prayer) 'yau devānām bhiṣajau' ('that are physicians of the gods', Tai. Br. III. 1. 2. 11). Then he makes additional offerings with clarified butter '*svāhā* to Aśvins, *svāhā* to the two that yoke horses, *svāhā* to the ear, svāhā to hearing' (Tai. Br. III. 1. 6. 13). Then he performs all details from sviṣṭakṛt offering to the gift of a cow. Then he puts down on Aśvattha leaves in front of Agni the food remaining after the offering of cooked food with the mantra 'yo aśvatthaḥ ... ketubhiḥ saha' (Tai. Br. I. 2. 1. 8-9). He brings together in a plate the water with which the sthālī is washed, the remainder of the clarified butter and of the water, sprinkles drops from it with an Aśvattha twig and goes round the horses thrice with his right towards the horses with the anuvāka beginning with 'yo vā aśvasya medhyasya lomāni veda' (he who knows the hair of the holy horse). So said the adorable Baudhāyana."

Śāntis are connected with *śakunas* also. The word śakuna means 'a bird' in the Ṛgveda (IV. 26. 6, IX. 86. 13, IX. 96. 19 and 23, IX. 107. 20, IX. 112. 2, X. 68. 7, X. 123. 6, X. 165. 2) and is a synonym of *Śakuni* (Ṛg. II. 42. 1, II. 43. 2 and 3) and *śakunti* (Ṛg. II. 42. 3, II. 43. 1). In Ṛg. X. 16. 6 (yat te kṛṣṇaḥ śakuna ātutoda) the crow is referred to as 'the dark bird'. It has been seen above that birds like *kapota* were regarded even

in the Ṛgveda as harbingers of impending evil and misfortune. Hence the word śakuna gradually came to mean premonition of evil conveyed by cries, movements, positions of birds and then any prognosticatory sign (not necessarily connected with birds). There is an extensive literature on śakunas. Some of it is mentioned here, viz. the Matsyapurāṇa (chap. 237, 241, 243), Agnipurāṇa (chap. 230–232), Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa II. 163–164, Padmapurāṇa (IV. 100. 65–126), Bṛhat-saṁhitā (chap. 85–95), Bṛhad-yogayātrā (chap. 23–27), Yogayātrā (chap. 14), the Nimitta of Bhadrabāhu (ms. in Bhau Daji collection of BBRAS No. 385 in Prof. Velankar's Catalogue pp. 126–127), Vasantarāja-śākuna,[1309] Mānasollāsa of king Someśvara Cālukya (1126–1138

1309. Vāsantarāja's work on 'śakunas' was published by the Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay (1906 A. D.), with the Sanskrit commentary of Bhānucandragaṇi, who was patronized by Emperor Akbar (in the latter half of the 16th century A.D.) and a Hindi translation by Sridhar Jatasankara Bhatta. As Vasantarāja is quoted by Adbhuta-sāgara which was begun in śaka 1089 (1167 A. D.), it follows that Vasantarāja would have to be placed before 1100 A. D. He is probably not much earlier than 700 A. D. as he does not appear to have been mentioned by Utpala in his extensive commentaries on Varāhamihira's works. Vasantarāja tells us (in the Introductory verses 3–5) that he was the son of Vijayarājabhaṭṭa and Sarasvatī and the younger brother of Śivarāja, that he was honoured by king Candradeva (king of Mithilā, acc. to the Com.) and composed the work on śakuna at the request of that king. He mentions (I. 10) Cūḍāmaṇi, jyotiṣa-śāstra, horā-śāstra and Svarodaya and (in I. 27) informs us that Atri, Garga, Guru, Śukra, Vasiṣṭha, Vyāsa, Kautsa, Bhṛgu and Gautama were the principal ancient sages that declared the knowledge of śakunas for the benefit (of human beings). Cūḍāmaṇi is rather an early work quoted in the Sārāvalī (5. 20 and 39. 8) of Kalyāṇavarman in the same breath with Varāhamihira.

The Nimitta attributed to Bhadrabāhu is an extensive work containing 26 chapters and about 1460 verses. It is described in the colophon at the end as 'naigranthe (nairgranthe?) Bhadrabāhuke Nimitte svapnādhyāyaḥ'. The first chapter states that in the time of king Senajit at Rājagṛha in Magadha pupils asked Bhadrabāhu to expound to them the *nimittas* and he did so. He is styled (in chap. II. 1) a *digambara* and the best of *śramaṇas*. The contents of chapters 2 to 26 are; Ulkā (meteors), halo, lightning, evening glow, clouds, winds and hurricanes, rain-fall, gandharvanagara (Fata Morgana), march of kings on invasion, portents affecting the king and the country due to the ripening of actions in former lives (chap. XIV has 177 verses on this), grahacāra as declared by Jina (chap. XV, 227 verses), the prognosticatory movements of Venus, Saturn, Jupiter, Mercury, Mars, Rāhu, Ketu, the Sun and the Moon; grahayuddha; conjunctions of planets; dreams. It appears that the work is later than Varāhamihira. As it is not within the pale of Dharmaśāstra Literature and hardly ever describes a śānti in the way in which the Purāṇas and medieval dharmaśāstra works provide it has been referred to in this work only rarely.

A. D.) II. 13 pp. 102-112, Adbhutasāgara (which profusely quotes Vasantarāja's work), Rājanītiprakāśa (pp. 345-347). Among these Vasantarāja-śākuna is the most comprehensive work on the subject of śakunas and has been quoted by the Adbhutasāgara and other later works. A brief account of the work would not be out of place and is given here. It is divided into twenty *vargas*[1310] (sections) and contains in different metres 1525 verses (as stated in *varga* II. 12). It states: it would declare the śakunas[1311] indicated in this world by groups of beings viz. bipeds (men and birds), quadrupeds (elephants, horses &c.), six-footed (bees), eight-footed (the mythical animal śarabha), beings having many feet (such as a scorpion) and having no feet (such as snakes); that is called *śakuna* which is the means of arriving at definite knowledge about auspicious or inauspicious consequences viz. movement (to the left, to the right &c.), the sounds or cries (of birds and beasts), their glances and activities. A person who is an expert in śakuna-śāstra, knowing that a certain object of his would involve difficulties or would be without difficulties, abandons it or begins it respectively. The work boasts that if it be well studied it requires no expounder, no mathematics and that by merely studying it, the reader acquires pleasant knowledge that yields rewards. The work repeats the view of Varāhamihira (in Bṛhat-saṁhitā 85.5 and on p. 558 above in n. 827) that śakunas indicate to men, whether going on a journey or residing in their houses, how the consequences of actions done in past lives will certainly bear fruit. He answers the objection that, if no man can escape his fate and has to reap the rewards of his past actions, this śāstra is of no use, by saying that the actions of former lives bear fruit only at certain times and places and a man can avoid the results of past actions just as he avoids snakes, fire, poison,

---

1310. प्रकीर्तिता विंशतिरेव यस्मिन्वर्गा महाशाकुनसारभूताः। सहस्रमेकं त्विह वृत्तसंख्या तथा सपादानि शतानि पञ्च। वसन्तराज II. 12.

1311. द्विपदचतुष्पदषट्पदमष्टापदमनेकपदमपदम्। यज्जन्तुवृन्दमस्मिन् वक्ष्यामस्तस्य शाकुनानि॥ शुभाशुभज्ञानविनिर्णयाय हेतुर्नृणां यः शकुनः स उक्तः। गतिस्वरालोकनभावचेष्टाः सङ्कीर्तयामो द्विपदादिकानाम्॥ सापायमेतन्निरपायमेतत्प्रयोजनं भावि ममेति बुद्ध्वा। असंशयं शाकुनशास्त्रविज्ञो जहाति चोपक्रमते मनुष्यः॥ ...अवेक्षितेऽस्मिन्न खलूपदेष्टा न चात्र कार्यं गणितेन किञ्चित्। उत्पद्यतेऽमुष्य हि ज्ञानमात्राज्ज्ञानं मनोहारि फलानुसारि॥ पूर्वजन्मकृतकर्मणः फलं पाकमेति नियमेन देहिनः। तत्प्रकाशयति दैवनोदितः प्रस्थितस्य शकुनः स्थितस्य च॥ ...दैवमेव यदि कारणं भवेत्कीतिशास्त्रमुपयुज्यते कथम्। यद्बलेन सुधियो महोद्यमाः पालयन्ति जगतीं जनाधिपाः॥ पूर्वजन्मजनितं पुराविदः कर्म दैवमिति संप्रचक्षते। उद्यमेन तदुपार्जितं तदा दैवमुद्यमवशं न तत्कथम्॥ वसन्तराज I. 6-8, 12, 14, 21-22. The अद्भुतसागर (p. 569) quotes शुभाशुभ० and other verses.

thorns and other (dangerous) things and that if fate alone be the deciding factor what is the use of the science of politics and government by following which wise kings protect the world with great effort? Learned men declare that *daiva* (fate) is only the *karma* produced (accumulated) in past lives; the *karma* in past lives was acquired by human effort; how can one then say that daiva does not depend on human effort? The subjects in the 20 *vargas* and the verses allotted to each by Vasantarāja may be briefly set down at one place: 1. Śāstrapratiṣṭhā (establishment of the śakunaśāstra by reasoning, verses 31); 2. Śāstrasaṅgraha, 13 verses (the statement of the contents of chapters and verses); 3. abhyarcana, verses 31 (how to honour the guru who expounds the śakunaśāstra and to offer worship to the birds and the eight lokapālas according to the procedure laid down by sages); 4. miśraka, verses 72 (general directions such as that the person out of several with reference to whom a śakuna may be examined up to what distance a śakuna operates, if many beings exhibit prognostications which should be followed, what birds and animals are powerful in what directions as to śakunas; *śānta*, *dagdha* and other directions); 5. śubhāśubha (auspicious and inauspicious things and sights) verses 16; 6. *nareṅgita*, verses 50 (the appearance, dress, gestures, speech, throbbing of the limbs of men and women that are auspicious or inauspicious); 7. śyāmāruta (chirpings of the bird called śyāmā, female cuckoo) 400 verses (worship of two images of the bird practically as a deity, the auspicious or inauspicious sounds, activities, motions with reference to invasion, coronation, peace and war, victory, marriage, rainfall, crops); 8. Pakṣivicāra, verses 57 (prognostications from the cries, sight, glances, movements of several birds such as swan, crane, *cakravāka*, parrot, *mainā*, peacock, kapiñjala, vulture, hawk, owl, pigeon, cock); 9. Cāṣa (the blue jay) verses 5; 10. khañjana (wagtail), verses 27; 11. karāpikā (a kind of crane), verses 11; 12. kākaruta (the cawing of crows) verses 181; 13. Piṅgalikāruta (cries of an owl-like bird), verses 200; 14. catuṣpada (four-footed animals like elephant, horse, ass, bull, buffalo, cow and she-buffalo, goat and sheep, camel, musk-rat, rat, monkey, cat, jackal), verses 50; 15. six-footed, many footed and snakes (verses 13); 16. Pipīlikā (ants), verses 15; 17. Pallī-vicāra (lizard also called kuḍyamatsya and gṛhagodhikā), verses 32; 18. Śvaceṣṭita (barking and other actions of dogs), verses 222; 19. Śivāruta (howling of female jackals), verses 90; 20. Śāstraprabhāva (the importance of this śakunaśāstra), verses 24.

A noticeable feature of Vasantarāja's work is that more than half of it (781 verses) is devoted to the sounds[1312] made by three birds viz. Śyāmā (400 verses), crow (187) Piṅgalikā (200) and that 312 verses are devoted to the barking, movements and howling of dogs (verses 222) and female jackals (verses 90). It is remarkable that among the Śāktas it is believed that a female jackal is a messenger of Kālī and is auspicious and on hearing its howl in the early morning a person should offer salutation and then success is in the hands of the sādhaka. The brief contents set out above will show that he extends the meaning of śakuna so as to include prognostications based on the actions of men and beasts. He himself says at the end that[1313] is śakuna, which in this world is remembered, heard, touched or seen or which is declared in dreams, since they all yield results. He claims that the system of śakunas is as authoritative as the Vedas, smṛtis and purāṇas, since it never fails to convey correct knowledge.[1314] Some of his interesting statements may be briefly set out. If an owl hoot at night on the top of a house that portends[1315] sorrow and the death of the owner's son (VIII. 40). This is in line with modern popular belief in India. The cawing of crows is at the head of all prognosticatory sounds. 'The barking of dogs is the essence among all śakunas.' The Bṛhad-yogayātrā[1316] provides that certain animals and birds are useless for prognostications at certain seasons viz. the *rohita* (red) deer, horse, goat, ass, deer, camel, hare, are useless in winter (śiśira); crow and cuckoo are

---

1312. लाभदश्चिलिचिलीतिनिनादः शूलिशूलिनिनदोपि तथैव। '''स्याद्भयाय नियमेन चिच्चीति निःस्वनश्चिलिकुनाद इहार्थः। कष्टदश्चिरिचिरीति विरावश्चीकुचीकु इति वैन्यविधायी। वसन्त० 7.52–54 pp. 119–120. How an ordinary man could distinguish between the sound 'cilicili' (portending gains), cici (portending danger), ciriciri (portending trouble) and cīkucīku (portending a wretched state) is difficult to say. Similarly, the Piṅgalā bird is supposed to make five sounds viz. किच्, किचि, किचिचि, किचिकिचि, किचिकिचिचि (वसन्तराज 13. 27–28) with different consequences.

1313. यदस्ति किंचिज्जगतीह वस्तु स्मृतं श्रुतं स्पृष्टमथापि दृष्टम्। स्वप्नान्तराद्यत्मतिपादितं तत्फलप्रदत्वाच्छकुनं वदन्ति॥ वसन्त० 20. 2 p. 513.

1314. वेदाः प्रमाणं स्मृतयः प्रमाणं लोके पुराणानि यथा प्रमाणम्। विशुद्धबोधाव्यभिचारिभावात्तथा प्रमाणं शकुनागमोऽयम्॥ वसन्त० 20. 8 p. 517.

1315. रात्रौ गृहस्योपरि भाषमाणो दुःखाय घूकः सुतमृत्यवे च। वसन्त० 8. 40. p. 246.

1316. रोहिताश्वाजबालेयकुरङ्गोष्ट्रमृगाः शशः। निष्फलाः शिशिरे ज्ञेया वसन्ते काककोकिलौ॥ न तु भाद्रपदे ग्राह्या सूकरश्ववृकादयः। शरद्यब्जादिगोक्रौञ्चाः श्रावणे हस्तिचातकौ॥ व्याघ्रर्क्षवानरद्वीपिमहिषाः सबिलेशयाः। हेमन्ते निष्फला ज्ञेया बालाः सर्वे विमाङ्गयाः॥ बृहद्योगयात्रा (ms.) chap. 23. 22–24.

useless in spring; boar, dog, wolf and the like should not be relied upon in Bhādrapada; in Śarad (autumn) lotuses (or conch), bull and birds like krauñca are useless; in Śrāvaṇa month, the elephant and *cātaka* bird; in Hemanta (early winter), tiger, bear, monkey, leopard, buffalo and all animals resorting to holes (like snakes) are useless and so are all young ones except of human beings. Vasantarāja in IV. 47–48 pp. 56–57 has the same provisions almost word for word. Vasantarāja's work appears to have been based mainly on Varāhamihira's Bṛhat-saṁhitā section on śakuna, chapters 85 to 95 (321 verses) in which Varāhamihira devotes 47 verses in chap. 85 to the cries of birds in general, deals with the movements and barking of dogs (88. 1–20) and female jackals (89. 1–15), the cries of crows (62 verses in chap. 94), to horses (92. 1–15), elephants (94. 1–14) and cows (90. 1–3).

Vasantarāja states[1317] that there are five excellent ones in the matter of śakunas viz. the Podakī bird, dog, crow, piṅgalā bird and the female jackal. Sarasvatī is the presiding deity of podakī, Yakṣa (Kubera) of dog, eagle of crow, Caṇḍī of piṅgalikā and the friend of Pārvatī of the female jackal. He further says that all animals and birds are presided over by deities; therefore a person who interprets śakunas should not kill them, as deities presiding over them might become angry. His statements about 'upaśruti' (oracular voices or words) are worth citing. 'At the time of *pradoṣa* or about the morning twilight when people are hardly speaking anything, a person that is ready to undertake any matter (business) should consider everywhere oracular voices. What a child says without being prompted to do so would not turn out to be untrue even at the end of a *Yuga*. No such easily understood and true śakuna exists for men other than upaśruti.' Both Mānasollāsa (II. 13, verses 920–926 pp. 112–113) and Vasantarāja (VI. pp. 78–80 verses 5–12) describe a curious mode of divining the future called 'upaśruti'.[1318] 'When all people are asleep and the public

---

1317. पोदकी श्वणकाकपिङ्गला जम्बुकप्रियतमा च पञ्चमी। एतदत्र मुनिसत्तमैः सदा कीर्त्यते शकुनरत्नपञ्चकम्॥ सरस्वती पोदकिकाप्रधाना यक्षोपि यक्षं गरुडश्च काकम्। चण्डी पुनः पिङ्गलिकां सदैव शिवां शिवादूत्यधितिष्ठतीह। वसन्तराज III. 3–4, pp. 22–23; कालिकापुराणम्। यः शिवाविरुतं श्रुत्वा शिवदूतीं शुभप्रदाम्। प्रणमेत्साधको भूत्वा तस्य कामाः करे स्थिताः॥ आह्निकतत्त्व (*Jiv. I p. 345*).

1318. प्रदोषकाले यदि वा प्रभाते लोके क्वचित् किंचन भाषमाणे। उपश्रुतिः कार्यसमुद्यतेन सर्वत्रिकी वा परिभावनीया॥ यद्बालकेनोक्तमनोदितेन तत्स्यादसत्यं न युगान्तरेपि। उपश्रुतेर्नान्यदिहास्ति किंचित्सत्यं सुबोधं शकुनं जनानाम्॥ वसन्तराज VI pp. 80–81.

(Continued on next page)

road is empty of people three married women accompanied by a maiden should worship Gaṇeśa (with gandha and flowers &c.); then, after making an obeisance to Caṇḍikā they should fill a measure of corn like *kudava* with *akṣata* grains on which sacred mantras have been recited seven times; they should then place the image of Gaṇeśa in that measure surrounded by the grass blades of a broom. They should take with them the *kudava* measure with Gaṇeśa image inside and repair to the house of a washerman. In front of that house they should cast white *akṣata* grains after (silently) revolving in their mind their thoughts (the matter they are intent on). Then they should with concentrated mind listen. When they hear any words coming from inside of the house talked by a man, a woman or a child or any one else uttered at pleasure (or without restraint of any kind), auspicious, or inauspicious, they should consider the sense of the words heard and the conclusion drawn as to the future project from the words would not turn out to be untrue. The same method may be followed by approaching the house of a cāṇḍāla.

(*Continued from last page*)

उपश्रुति occurs in the Ṛg. I. 10. 3 and appears to mean simply 'coming near to listen.' Vide also Ṛg. VIII. 8. 5 and VIII. 34. 11. अर्चयित्वा गणाधीशं सर्वविघ्नविनाशनम्। कुमार्या सहिता नार्यस्तिस्रः सुप्ते जनेऽखिले। अक्षतैः पूरयेयुस्ता यत्किञ्चित् कुडवादिकम्। चण्डिकायै नमः कृत्वा सप्तकृत्वोऽभिमन्त्रितम्॥ संमार्जनीकृतावेष्टे स्थापयेयुर्गणाधिपम्। व्रजेयुस्तं समादाय रजकस्य निकेतनम्। तद्गृहस्य पुरोभागे निक्षिपेयुः सिताक्षतान्। मनोगतं समुद्दिश्य शृणुयुः सुसमाहिताः॥ श्रूयते वचनं किंचिद् रजकालयमध्यगम्। नार्या नरेण बालेन प्रोक्तमन्येन केनचित्॥ स्वैरसंलापसंभूतं शुभं वा यदि वाशुभम्। शृण्वन्तीभिः फलं ज्ञेयं तद्वाक्यार्थविचारतः॥ चण्डालनिलयेऽप्येवं श्रवणे बोधने क्रमः। यद् ब्रूयुर्वचनं तत्र तत्तथा न तदन्यथ॥ मानसोल्लास II. 13, verses 920-926. वसन्तराज employs almost the same words It is difficult to say whether one borrows from the other. Probably both draw on the same source. कुडव is a measure of grain, equal to ¼ of a *prastha*. Acc. to भविष्य q. by हेमाद्रि (on व्रत vol. I. p. 57 and परा. मा. II. 1. p. 141). 2 पलs = प्रसृति, 2 प्रसृतिs = कुडव, 4 कुडवs = प्रस्थ, 4 प्रस्थs = आढक, 4 आढकs = द्रोण, 16 द्रोणs = खारी. शबर on जै. X. 3. 45 mentions कुडव, आढक, द्रोण and खारी. पाणिनि mentions आढक and खारी in V. 1. 53 and V. 4. 101. According to ancient smṛtis, a washerman was one of the seven antyajas; vide रजकश्चर्मकारश्च नटो बुरुड एव च। कैवर्तमेदभिल्लाश्च सप्तैते चान्त्यजाः स्मृताः॥ अत्रि. 199, अङ्गिरस् (Jiv. I. p. 554), यम 33 (Ānand. ed. of smṛtis). While these pages were passing through the press, the author got a copy of a recent work 'The interpretation of dreams in the ancient Near East' with translation of an 'Assyrian Dream book' by A. Leo Oppenheim (as vol. 46 part 3, 1956, of the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series). He could not refer to the interesting parallels from the book as regards dreams, but on p. 211 the writer states that the use of chance utterances made by unconcerned persons was known in the ancient Near East not only in Palestine but also in Mesopotamia.

A peculiar mode akin to 'upaśruti' is described in the Padmapurāṇa, Pātālakhaṇḍa, chap. 100 verses 65–166. It is narrated in that chapter that Bibhīṣaṇa was put in chains by Draviḍas when the former saw Śiva-liṅga established by Rāma at Rāmeśvara and when no one could explain how it happened, Rāma questioned Śambhu himself who explained that the Purāṇas (mentioned in verses 51–53) may be employed as containing prognosticatory words. The procedure is that a maiden more than five years of age and less than ten years or any girl who has not attained puberty may be honoured with *gandha*, flowers, incense and other upacāras, she should be made to recite the words 'speak the truth, speak what is agreeable, O blessed Sarasvatī! salutation to you, salutation to you!' She should be given three pairs of dūrvā grass and she should be asked to cast them between two leaves of the book. The verse between two leaves would be indicative of success in the undertaking. The verse should be carefully considered and its meaning settled and applied to the matter in hand. This is like *sortes sanctorum* or sortes Vergilianae i. e. divination by opening at random the Scriptures or a book of Virgil or by pricking the text with a pin. Then directions are given as to what should be done if the leaves are half burnt or indistinct &c. and it is said that one should look upon the verse as sent by fate like the words in the upaśruti method.[1319] It is further stated that this method should not be resorted to every day, but rarely and that then one should worship the Purāṇa the previous night and in the morning should consult the Purāṇa for śakuna (verses 114–116). The Skanda is the best among all Purāṇas for this purpose of śakuna; some hold that the Viṣṇupurāṇa and the Rāmāyaṇa also may be consulted, but the author of the Padma says that Viṣṇupurāṇa may not be used for this purpose, since if a man devoid of proper conduct honours it for consultation, then inauspicious indications come out (verses 122–125). Śambhu himself worshipped Skanda-purāṇa, asked the question why Bibhīṣaṇa, devotee of Śiva, had fetters put on him (verses 131–132). Then three verses were seen that gave indications (verses 133–135), two of which[1320] are cited below. At the end the

1319. दैवायत्तो हि स श्लोको दैवं हि बलवत्तरम्। उपश्रुतिषु यद्वच्च नापराधो द्विजस्य तु। विस्मयो न च कर्तव्यो दैवस्य कुटिला गतिः। पद्म, पाताल, 100. 77–78.

1320. बद्ध्वा समुद्रं स तु राघवेन्द्रो रुरोध दुष्टान् क्षणदाचरेन्द्रान्। योद्धुं समागत्य समाययुस्ते लङ्कापुरस्थास्त्वतिकायमुख्याः॥ अट्टशूला जनपदाः शिवशूला द्विजास्तथा। प्रमदाः

(*Continued on next page*)

Purāṇa says that the Ādiparva of the Mahābhārata or all its *parvans* may be employed for this purpose of śakuna (verses 163–164).

A similar method of finding out omens and of divination from the two works of the great Hindi poet and saint Tulasīdās (born in *saṁvat* 1589 i. e. 1532 A. D.) viz. Rāmājñā (or Rāma-śakunāvalī containing 343 *doha* verses) and Rāmaśalākā is described at some length by G. A. Grierson in I. A. vol. XXII pp. 204 ff and in Festgabe H. Jacobi pp. 449–455.

It is worthy of note that even scientific works like the Carakasaṁhitā ask the physician to notice the condition of the patient, of the messenger, and the actions of the physician and inauspicious omens. They are described in Indriyasthāna chap. 12. A few notable verses may be cited here. 'That patient would only live for a month on whose head arises only powder (dandruff or the like) resembling the powder of dry cowdung and that slides down (from the head); that patient will not live even for a fortnight whose chest dries up when he takes a bath and anoints his body with sandalwood paste while all other limbs are yet wet' (verse 12). 'Those messengers from a patient who come to a physician when the latter is offering oblations into fire or is offering piṇḍas to his pitṛs, will kill the patient (i. e. indicate the approaching death of the patient, verse 16); a woman who is in a pitiable state, terrified, hurried, troubled, dirty and unchaste, three persons (coming together), deformed persons, impotent persons—these are messengers of those who are about to die' (verses 21–22); 'a physician should not go (to see a patient) on being called by a messenger when the physician sees, while the messenger is describing the condition of the patient, an inauspicious omen or a sorrowing man or a corpse or the decoration meant for the dead'; verses 67–70 dilate on the signs of an auspicious messenger and verses 71–79 set out auspicious omens such as the sight of curds, whole grains, brāhmaṇas, bulls, king, jewels, jar full of water, white horse &c. The physician is however advised not to declare an inauspicious omen even when he sees it that would give a shock or cause pain to the patient or even to anyone else (verse 63).

(*Continued from last page*)
केशशूलिन्यो भविष्यन्ति कलौ युगे ॥ पद्म, पाताल 100. 133–134. The second verse is enigmatic and occurs in कलिस्वरूपवर्णन. Vide Vanaparva, chap. 188. 42 where it occurs and *H. of Dh. vol. III.* p. 893 (for explanation) and p. 1012 for quotation from Vanaparva.

It would be of use to students of śāntis if the śānti-sūktas of the Ṛgveda are mentioned in one place. They are:

(1) Ā no bhadrāḥ (Ṛg. I. 89. 1–10)
(2) Svasti na Indro (Ṛg. I. 89. 6–10)
(3) Śam na Indrāgnī (Ṛg. VII. 35. 1–11)[1321]
(4) Yata Indra bhayāmahe (Ṛg. VIII. 61. 13–18)
(5) Bhadram no api vātaya manaḥ (Ṛg. X. 20. 1)
(6) Āśuḥ śiśāno (Ṛg. X. 103. 1–13)
(7) Muñcāmi tvā (Ṛg. X. 161. 1–5)
(8) Tyam-ū ṣu (Ṛg. X. 178. 1–3)
(9) Mahi triṇām (Ṛg. X. 185. 1–3)
(10) Rātrī vyakhyat (Ṛg. X. 127. 1–8)

Most of the above hymns occur wholly or partly in the Atharvaveda, the Tai. S. and other Vedic works.

Then there are certain hymns that are called Rakṣoghna[1322] (destroying evil spirits) such as 'Kṛṇuṣva pājaḥ' (Ṛg. IV. 4. 1–15), 'Rakṣohaṇam' (Ṛg. X. 87. 1–25), 'Indrāsomā tapatam' (Ṛg. VII. 104. 1–25), 'Agne haṁsi nyatriṇam' (Ṛg. X. 118. 1–9), 'Brahmaṇāgniḥ' (Ṛg. X. 162. 1–6). Some of these also occur wholly or partly in the Tai. S., Atharvaveda and other Vedic works.

The eleven anuvākas of the Taittirīya Saṁhitā IV. 5 beginning with the words 'namas-te Rudra manyava' are styled Rudrādhyāya or simply Rudra. Reciting them once is styled 'āvartana', but the recitation of these eleven times is called 'Ekādaśinī'. Recitation of the Ekādaśinī eleven times is called in popular parlance Laghurudra, eleven repetitions[1323] of this

---

1321. In the description of the dāna called Tulāpuruṣa contained in the Matsyapurāṇa chap. 274 occurs the half verse 'जपेयुः शान्तिकाध्यायं जापकाः सर्वतोदिशम्' (274.56) which Aparārka quotes (on p 317) and remarks 'शान्तिकाध्यायं शं न इन्द्राग्नी इति सूक्तम्।'

1322. कौशिकसूत्र 126. 9 mentions 'रक्षोघ्नैश्च सूक्तैः' but does not state what they are.

1323. So eminent a writer as कमलाकरभट्ट in his शान्तिरत्न states that एकादशिनी and लघुरुद्र mean the same thing. 'एकादशरुद्रैः रुद्रीत्युच्यते। सैव लघुरुद्रः रुद्रैकादशिनीति चोच्यते। ताभिरेकादशभिर्महारुद्रः। तैरेकादशभिरतिरुद्र इति। ''रुद्रं महातिरुद्रं च अपेक्षार्थस्य गौरवात्।' folio 255 a. Similarly, in the Mahānyāsavidhibhāṣya (ms. in the collection of the Bombay Asiatic Society, described in Prof. Velankar's catalogue at No. 794) no *Laghurudra* is mentioned, but only Rudra, Rudraikādaśinī, Mahārudra and Atirudra.

last are designated Mahārudra and eleven Mahārudras are called Atirudra. The Rudra may take three forms viz. *japa* (muttering), *homa* (offering into Agni oblations to the accompaniment of the mantras), or *abhiṣeka* (sprinkling a person with the holy water over which the mantras have been recited) For reciting Rudrādhyāya the yajamāna, if he cannot himself recite it, may employ one brāhmaṇa and also for Ekādaśinī; but for Laghurudra and Mahārudra eleven brāhmaṇas are generally employed and for Atirudra eleven or 121. Ekadaśinī and Laghurudra are very much in vogue even now in Mahārāṣṭra. Rudrābhiṣeka is described in Baud. gṛhyaśeṣasūtra II. 18. 11-16.

The mantra 'Tryambakam yajāmahe' (Ṛg. VII. 59. 12, Tai. S. I. 8. 6. 2, Vāj. S. III. 60) is called Mṛtyuñjaya. Japa of it is prescribed for relief against premature death. The Baudhāyana-gṛhyaśeṣasūtra (III. 11) prescribes a somewhat more elaborate rite and provides that the mantras to be recited are 'apaitu mṛtyuḥ' (Tai. Br. III. 7. 14. 4), 'param mṛtyo' (Tai. Br. III. 7. 14. 5), 'mā no mahāntam' (Ṛg. I. 114. 7), 'mā nas-toke' (Tai. S. III. 4. 11. 2), 'Tryambakam yajāmahe' (Tai. S. I. 8. 6. 2), 'Ye te sahasram' (Tai. Br. III. 10. 8. 2).

It is unnecessary for the author to say what should be done in these days as to śāntis. Most of the śāntis except a few, as pointed out above in various places, are no longer performed. Even the few that are yet performed may cease altogether in the near future, if one is to judge from modern trends.

SECTION IV

THE PURĀṆAS AND DHARMAŚĀSTRA

CHAPTER XXII

Origin and development of Purāṇa literature

The History of Dharmaśāstra (vol. I pp. 160–167) has a brief chapter on the Purāṇas. It has been shown therein how the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, the Chāndogya and Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣads mention Itihāsa and Purāṇa (sometimes collectively as 'Itihāsapurāṇam' and sometimes separately as 'Itihāsaḥ Purāṇam') and how some of the extant Purāṇas are much earlier than the 6th century A.D. It is further pointed out there that the number of the principal Purāṇas has been traditionally handed down as eighteen,[1324] that some purāṇas such as the Matsya, the Viṣṇu, the Vāyu and Bhaviṣya contain much Dharmaśāstra material, that the Garuḍa-purāṇa and the Agnipurāṇa contain several hundred verses each that are identical with verses of the Yājñavalkya smṛti, that there is great divergence as to the extent of almost all Purāṇas, that some of the Purāṇas themselves enumerate minor works called Upapurāṇas, that the Purāṇas are divided into three groups, viz. *sāttvika*, *rājasa* and *tāmasa* (as done by Garuḍa I. 223. 17–20, and Padma VI. 263. 81–84). Details were also furnished as to the chapters of the Purāṇas in which the several topics of Dharmaśāstra (such as *ācāra*, *āhnika*, *dāna*, *rājadharma*, *śrāddha*, *tīrtha*) were dealt with.

In the present section it is proposed to trace the great transformation that took place in the ideas, ideals and practices of the ancient Indian people owing to the influence of the Purāṇas in the first few centuries of the Christian era.

Before proceeding further several preliminary matters have to be dealt with. The mention of Purāṇas as a class of literature

---

1324. The Matsya (53. 18–19), Agni (272. 4–5) and Nārada (I. 92. 26) enumerate Vāyu among the eighteen Mahāpurāṇas, while the Viṣṇu (III. 6.19), Mārkaṇḍeya (134.8), Kūrma (I. 1.13), Padma (I. 62.2), Liṅga (I. 39.61), Bhāgavata (XII. 7.23), Brahmavaivarta (III. 133.14) substitute Śaiva for Vāyu and omit Vāyu altogether from the list of the eighteen Mahāpurāṇas.

goes back much farther than was pointed out in the H. of DH. vol. I. p. 160. The Atharvaveda[1325] mentions Purāṇa (in the singular) in XI. 7. 24 and XV. 6. 10–11. 'The ṛk and sāman verses, the chandas, the Purāṇa along with the Yajus formulæ, all sprang from the remainder of sacrificial food, (as also) the gods that resort to heaven. He changed his place and went over to great direction; and Itihāsa and Purāṇa, gāthās, verses in praise of heroes followed in going over.' The Śatapatha brāhmaṇa also (XI. 5. 6. 8) mentions 'Itihāsapurāṇam' (as one compound word) and states that on the 9th day of the Pāriplava the *hotṛ* priest instructs among other matters as follows: 'The Purāṇa is the Veda; this it is; thus saying let him narrate some Purāṇa' (XIII. 4. 3. 13.).[1326] The Śāṅkhāyana[1327] Śrautasūtra (XVI. 2. 27) and the Āśvalāyana Śrauta (X. 7) remark that on two days of the Pāriplava the Itihāsaveda and Purāṇaveda were to be recited. But the two sūtras (though affiliated to the Ṛgveda) differ as to the day on which they were to be recited. It is difficult to say whether the Atharvaveda, the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and the Upaniṣads knew several works called Purāṇa or whether there was only a single work called

---

1325. ऋचः सामानि छन्दांसि पुराणं यजुषा सह। उच्छिष्टाज्जज्ञिरे सर्वे दिवि देवा दिविश्रितः॥ अथर्व XI. 7. 24; स बृहतीं दिशमनुव्यचलत्। तमितिहासश्च पुराणं च गाथाश्च नाराशंसीश्चानुव्यचलन्। अथर्व XV. 6. 10–11. Vide Prof. Hazra's interpretation of the first verse in ABORI. vol. 36, 1955, pp. 190–203 and criticism thereof below.

1326. मध्वाहुतयो ह वा एता देवानां यदनुशासनानि विद्या वाकोवाक्यमितिहासपुराणं गाथा नाराशंसीरित्यहरहः स्वाध्यायमधीते। शतपथ XI. 5. 6. 8; अथाष्टमेऽहन्। ...मत्स्याश्च मत्स्यहनश्चोपसमेता भवन्ति। तानुपदिशतीतिहासो वेदः सोयमिति कंचिदितिहासमाचक्षीत। अथ नवमेऽहन्। ...तानुपदिशति पुराणं वेदः सोयमिति किंचित्पुराणमाचक्षीत। शतपथ XIII. 4. 3. 12–13. According to the commentary Itihāsa means such cosmological myths as 'in the beginning there was nothing but water' and Purāṇa means stories such as that of Purūravas and Urvaśī. Compare गोपथब्राह्मण (ed. by Gaastra) I. 1. 21.

1327. समासासु समासासु दक्षिणत आहवनीयस्य हिरण्यकशिपावासीनोऽभिषिक्ताय पुत्रामात्यपरिवृताय राज्ञे पारिप्लवमाचक्षीत। ...प्रथमेहनि मनुर्वैवस्वतस्तस्य मनुष्या विशस्त इम आसत इति गृहमेधिन उपसमानीताः स्युस्तानुपदिशति। ऋचो वेदः सोऽयमिति सूक्तं निगदेत्॥ आश्व. श्रौ. X. 6. 10–X. 7. 1. समासासु refers to the three iṣṭis to Savitṛ offered every day in the morning, mid-day and evening; the com. of गार्ग्यनारायण explains: समासास्विति वीप्सावचनात् पारिप्लवाख्यानमपि संवत्सरमहरहः कर्तव्यमिति गम्यते॥ The आश्व. श्रौ. connects Itihāsa with the 9th day and Purāṇavidyā with the eighth, while the शां. श्रौ. reverses this order. The आश्व. श्रौ. winds up 'एवमेतत्पर्यायशः संवत्सरमाचक्षीत। दशमीं दशमीं समापयन्। संवत्सरान्ते दीक्षेत।' X. 7. 9–11; the शाङ्खायनश्रौत derives पारिप्लव 'तद्यत्पुनः पुनः परिप्लवते तस्मात्पारिप्लवम्' (XVI. 2. 36).

Purāṇa known to them. But from the fact that the Tai. Ār. (II. 10) speaks of Itihāsas and Purāṇas (in the plural) it would not be unreasonable to suppose that in the later Vedic period at least some works (three or more) called Purāṇas existed and were studied and recited by those that were engaged in solemn sacrifices like the Aśvamedha. It is not unlikely that, where the singular 'Purāṇam' was employed in the Vedic texts, a class of works was meant. The facts that 'Itihāsa-Purāṇa' is called the fifth Veda in the Upaniṣads and that the Śatapatha employs 'Itihāsa-Purāṇam' as one compound word lead to the inference that the two categories 'Itihāsa' and 'Purāṇa' were similar in contents at least in several respects. The Āpastamba-dharmasūtra[1328] quotes two verses each in two places from a Purāṇa (in the singular), once cites the view of the Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa and in another place gives the summary of a Purāṇa passage or verse which says that, when a person attacks another

---

1328. अथ पुराणे श्लोकावुदाहरन्ति । उद्यतामाहृतां भिक्षां पुरस्तादप्रवेदिताम् । भोज्यां मेने प्रजापतिरपि दुष्कृतकारिणः ॥ न तस्य पितरोऽश्नन्ति दश वर्षाणि पञ्च च । न च हव्यं वहत्यग्निर्यस्तामभ्यवमन्यते । आप. ध. सू. I. 6. 19. 13; these two are the same as Manu IV. 248-249 with slight variations; अष्टाशीतिसहस्राणि ये प्रजामीषुर्ऋषयः । दक्षिणेनार्यम्णः पन्थानं ते श्मशानानि भेजिरे ॥ अष्टाशीतिसहस्राणि ये प्रजां नेषुर्ऋषयः । उत्तरेणार्यम्णः पन्थानं तेऽमृतत्वं हि कल्पन्ते ॥ इत्यूर्ध्वरेतसां प्रशंसा । आप. ध. सू. II. 9. 23. 3-6. These two verses respectively say that those who lead the life of a householder performing sacrifices and desiring progeny have to undergo deaths (lit. cemeteries, śmaśānāni) and births (i.e. they only reach heaven and are born again and again), while those that do not desire progeny but remain celebate throughout life become immortal (i. e. are not born again). शङ्कराचार्य in his भाष्य on बृह. उप. VI. 2. 15 quotes a स्मृति verse as follows: 'अष्टाशीतिसहस्राणामृषीणामूर्ध्वरेतसाम् । उत्तरेणार्यम्णः पन्थानस्तेऽमृतत्वं हि भेजिरे ॥'. Compare: अष्टाशीतिसहस्राणि यतीनामूर्ध्वरेतसाम् । उदक् पन्थानमर्यम्णः स्थितान्याभूतसंप्लवम् ॥ विष्णुपुराण II. 8. 93, वायु 50. 213, 218, मत्स्य 124. 102-3 and 107, ब्रह्माण्ड II. 7. 180 (first half). The third passage of Āp. is पुनःसर्गे बीजार्था भवन्तीति भविष्यत्पुराणे । आप. ध. II. 9. 24. 6. This means that those who perform what is laid down in the Veda serve as the seed (i. e. they become Prajāpatis) of the new creation after *pralaya* (dissolution). Compare वायु III. 184-186, one of which is तत्राष्टाशीतिसाहस्रा मुनयो गृहमेधिनः । पुनरावर्तिनो बीजभूता धर्मप्रवर्तकाः ॥ The 4th passage of आप. ध. सू. is यो हिंसार्थमभिक्रान्तं हन्ति मन्युरेव मन्युं स्पृशति न तस्मिन्दोष इति पुराणे । I. 10. 29. 7. On killing a brāhmaṇa there was a difference of opinion; Āp. probably paraphrases some verses such as Manu VIII. 350-351, the latter of which is : नाततायिवधे दोषो हन्तुर्भवति कश्चन । प्रकाशं वाप्रकाशं वा मन्युस्तं मन्युमृच्छति ॥. Both verses of Manu occur in मत्स्य 227. 115-117, विष्णुधर्मसूत्र V. 189-190, बृहस्पति IX 349-350; पद्म V. 45. 45-46 are very similar. Vide Bühler in I. A. vol. 25 pp. 323 ff.

with the object of harming him and the person attacked kills the attacker, no sin is incurred. From these passages it is clear that Āpastamba had before him a Purāṇa called Bhaviṣyat and also that the Purāṇa or Purāṇas which he knew contained rules about the food to be accepted for eating, about the stages of householder and the perpetual student, about resisting an ātatāyin even unto death and about creation and re-creation after dissolution. These matters fall within the province of Smṛtis and Purāṇas. As the word 'purāṇa' means 'ancient', the word Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa is a contradiction in terms. Long before Āpastamba the word Purāṇa had come to mean a work dealing with ancient tales &c; several such works must have been composed and they probably began to incorporate contemporary events and wrote about such events in a prophetic vein. Hence arose the name Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa.[1329] As Āpastamba mentions a Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa and also Purāṇa, it follows that before 500 B. C. several Purāṇas existed one of which was called the Bhaviṣyat and the Purāṇas then known contained the topics of *sarga*, *pratisarga* and smṛti matters.

This conclusion is strongly corroborated by other facts. The Gautama-dharmasūtra provides that a learned (*bahuśruta*) brāhmaṇa is one who knows peoples' usages, the Veda, the aṅgas (auxiliary lores), Vākovākya (dialogues), Itihāsa and Purāṇa and that the king in administering the affairs of his kingdom and justice has to depend upon the Veda, Dharmaśāstra, the (six) *aṅgas* of the Veda, the (four) Upavedas and Purāṇa.[1330]

From the above discussion it appears that, though we are not in a position to make definite statements about the contents of the Purāṇa or Purāṇas referred to in the Atharva, Śat. Br., Tai. Ār. and the Upaniṣads, by the time of Āp. and Gautama, Purāṇas approaching in contents to some extent at least some of the extant Purāṇas had come into existence. The

---

1329. It may be noted that the Varāhapurāṇa (chap. 177. 34) expressly mentions the Bhaviṣyat purāṇa. The reference shows that (in 177. 54–57) Sāmba, son of Kṛṣṇa, renovated the Purāṇa called Bhaviṣyat and established images of the Sun-god in four places viz. (1) to the south of the Yamunā, (2) between Yamunā and Multan, called Kālapriya, (3) at Mūlasthāna (modern Multan), (4) in Mathurā; vide Bhaviṣya (Venk. ed.) I. 72. 4–7 for three centres of the Sun image. The Matsya 53. 62 also mentions the Bhaviṣyat.

1330. तस्य च व्यवहारो वेदो धर्मशास्त्राण्यङ्गान्युपवेदाः पुराणम्। गौ. ध. सू. XI. 19.

Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya states that [1331] 'trayī' means the three Vedas, viz. Sāmaveda, Ṛgveda, Yajurveda and that the Atharvaveda and Itihāsaveda are (also) vedas'. It follows that in Kauṭilya's time Itihāsa was a definite work like the three vedas. In another place Kauṭilya provides 'a minister proficient in Arthaśāstras and bent on the good of the king should, by means of itivṛtta (history or historical occurrences) and Purāṇas, admonish (and bring to the right path) a king led astray by other guides.' In laying down a time-table for the king's daily routine of work, [1332] Kauṭilya provides that in the latter part of the day the king should listen to Itihāsa and defines the latter as comprehending Purāṇa, *itivṛtta*, ākhyāyikā (narrations), udāharaṇa (heroic examples), Dharmaśāstra and Arthaśāstra (science of government and statecraft). It appears that Kauṭilya meant by 'Itihāsa' a Mahābhārata more or less very like the extant one, which describes [1333] itself as the best of itihāsas, as a Dharmaśāstra, Arthaśāstra, Kāmaśāstra and as Kārṣṇaveda. Among the officials [1334] to be maintained by the king with salaries are mentioned astrologers, persons conversant with portents and auspicious times, Paurāṇika, Sūta and Māgadha, who were to be paid 1000 (paṇas) as salary. The Dakṣasmṛti, [1335] which is comparatively an early smṛti prescribes the reading of Itihāsa and Purāṇa for all *dvija* house-holders in the 6th and 7th parts of the day (divided into eight parts). The Auśanasa-smṛti prescribes that the Vedāṅgas and Purāṇas should be studied in the dark half of the months after Utsarjana (vide Jīv. part I p. 515). When the

---

1331. सामर्ग्यजुर्वेदास्त्रयस्त्रयी अथर्ववेदेतिहासवेदौ च वेदाः । अर्थशास्त्र I. 3; मुख्यैरवगृहीतं वा राजानं तत्प्रियाश्रितः । इतिवृत्तपुराणाभ्यां बोधयेदर्थशास्त्रवित् ॥ अर्थशास्त्र V. 6, p. 257 (a verse at end).

1332. पूर्वमहर्भागं हस्त्यश्वरथायुधविद्यासु विनयं गच्छेत्, पश्चिममितिहासश्रवणे । पुराणमितिवृत्तमाख्यायिकोदाहरणं धर्मशास्त्रमर्थशास्त्रं चेतीतिहासः । अर्थशास्त्र I. 5, p. 10.

1333. अर्थशास्त्रमिदं प्रोक्तं धर्मशास्त्रमिदं महत् । कामशास्त्रमिदं प्रोक्तं व्यासेनामितबुद्धिना । ...इतिहासोत्तमादस्माज्जायन्ते कविबुद्धयः । ...अस्याख्यानस्य विषये पुराणं वर्तते द्विजाः । आदिपर्व 2. 83, 85-86. In आदिपर्व 62. 23 the महाभारत is called धर्मशास्त्र, अर्थशास्त्र and मोक्षशास्त्र. The मार्कण्डेयपुराण (1. 6-7) describes the Mahābhārata as the śāstra of all the four *puruṣārthas* and as the means of knowing the proper actions for all four varṇas.

1334. कार्तान्तिक-नैमित्तिक-मौहूर्तिक-पौराणिक-सूतमागधाः पुरोहितपुरुषाः सर्वाध्यक्षाश्च साहस्राः । अर्थशास्त्र V. 3 (भृत्यभरणीयम्) p. 247. पौराणिक means one who studies or knows the purāṇas, acc. to the sūtra 'तदधीते तद्वेद' पा. IV. 2. 59.

1335. इतिहासपुराणाद्यैः षष्ठसप्तमकौ नयेत् । अष्टमे लोकयात्रां तु बहिःसन्ध्यां ततः पुनः ॥ दक्ष II. 69; the गरुडपुराण I. 213. 158 has the first half.

Manusmṛti[1336] provides that in a śrāddha rite the brāhmaṇas invited for dinner should recite the Vedas, the Dharmaśāstras, stories, Itihāsas, Purāṇas and khila hymns (such as Śrīsūkta), it should be taken as referring to Purāṇa works closely resembling the extant ones. The Yājñavalkya[1337] smṛti enumerates the fourteen Vidyāsthānas (branches of knowledge) and sources of *dharma* as Purāṇa, Nyāya (logic), Mīmāṁsā (rules of Vedic interpretation), Dharmaśāstras, the aṅgas of the Veda and the (four) Vedas. These fourteen are probably arranged in the order of importance and authoritativeness at the time of the Yājñavalkya-smṛti. Yāj. refers to sages that expounded or promulgated the Vedas, Purāṇas, the vidyās (six aṅgas), the Upaniṣads, the ślokas (itihāsa?), aphoristic works (like those of Jaimini or on nyāya), the *bhāṣyas* and whatever other literature exists. In another place Yāj. recommends that a householder after a bath in the morning and worship of gods and pitṛs should engage in japa-yajña, in which he should mutter according to his ability parts of the Veda, of Atharvaveda, Itihāsa and Purāṇas and philosophical texts. These passages from Yājñavalkya establish that Itihāsa and Purāṇa went together, that both were works distinct from Vedic Literature and that both had attained a status of sacredness and authoritativeness in matters of dharma in the time of the Yājñavalkya-smṛti not later than 3rd century (A. D.). A Vārtika mentioned by the Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇ IV. 2. 59-60 provides for the formation of words with the affix 'ṭhak' (*ika*) in the case of ākhyāna (such as Yāvakrītika, Yāyātika), ākhyāyikā (such as Vāsavadattika, Saumanottarika), itihāsa (aitihāsika), Purāṇa (paurāṇika) in the sense of one who studies or knows that.[1338] In numerous passages the Mahābhārata mentions Purāṇa in the singular

---

1336. स्वाध्यायं श्रावयेत्पित्र्ये धर्मशास्त्राणि चैव हि । आख्यानानीतिहासांश्च पुराणानि खिलानि च ॥ मनु III. 232.

1337. पुराणन्यायमीमांसाधर्मशास्त्राङ्गमिश्रिताः । वेदाः स्थानानि विद्यानां धर्मस्य च चतुर्दश ॥ याज्ञ० I. 3; यतो वेदाः पुराणानि विद्योपनिषदस्तथा । श्लोकाः सूत्राणि भाष्याणि यच्च किंचन वाङ्मयम् ॥ याज्ञ० III. 189; वेदाथर्वपुराणानि सेतिहासानि शक्तितः । जपयज्ञप्रसिद्ध्यर्थं विद्यां चाध्यात्मिकीं जपेत् ॥ याज्ञ० I. 101. Compare विष्णुपुराण V. 1. 37-38 with याज्ञ० I. 3. Sometimes the branches of knowledge are said to be 18 by adding the four upavedas, viz. आयुर्वेद, धनुर्वेद, गान्धर्ववेद and अर्थशास्त्र, to the 14 mentioned by Yāj. Vide विष्णुपु० III. 6. 25-26 (about 14 विद्याs and उपवेद) q. by अपरार्क p. 6 and कल्पतरु (ब्रह्मचारि०) p. 22.

1338. आख्यानाख्यायिकेतिहासपुराणेभ्यश्च ठञ्वक्तव्यः । महाभाष्य on 'तदधीते तद्वेद । क्रतूक्थादिसूत्रान्ताट्ठक्' पा. IV. 2. 59-60. The महाभाष्य gives the examples cited above in brackets.

(as in Ādi 5. 2, 31. 3-4, 51. 6, 65. 52, Udyoga 178. 47-48, Karṇa 34. 44, Śānti 208. 5, Anuśāsana 22. 12, 102. 21) and sometimes Purāṇas in the plural (as in Ādi 109. 20, Virāṭa 51.10, Strīparva 13. 2, Śānti 339. 106, Svargārohaṇa 5. 46-47 (which refers to Purāṇas as 18).[1339] Further, the Matsya-purāṇa and a Purāṇa proclaimed by Vāyu are mentioned in the Vanaparva.[1340] It is impossible to hold that all the numerous references to Purāṇas are later interpolations, though a few may be so. It is not correct to say that no Purāṇa resembling the extant ones existed before the time when Purāṇa stories were collected in the Mahābhārata. There is hardly any evidence to support any such view.

Early Sanskrit authors like Bāṇa (first half of 7th century A. D.) and commentators like Śabara (not later than between 200-400 A. D.), Kumārila (7th century A. D.), Śaṅkarācārya (between 650-800 A. D.) and Viśvarūpa (800-850 A. D.) leave us in no doubt that in their times Purāṇas existed, the contents of which were just like those of the extant Purāṇas. Śabara in his bhāṣya[1341] on Jaimini X. 4. 23, while discussing the question as to what is meant by 'devatā' in relation to sacrifices, states that one view was that they are Agni and others, that are described in the Itihāsa and Purāṇas as dwelling in heaven. Bāṇa in his Kādambarī and Harṣacarita frequently refers to the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas, but two passages from the Kādambarī and one from the Harṣacarita are very interesting. While describing the hermitage of the sage Jābāli Bāṇa employs a *śleṣa* 'there was Vāyupralapita (proclaiming by god Vāyu; babbling due to the windy humour) in Purāṇa (but no babbling in the hermitage)[1342]. Similarly, in the des-

1339. महत्त्वाद्भारवत्त्वाच्च महाभारतमुच्यते । ...अष्टादश पुराणानि धर्मशास्त्राणि सर्वशः । वेदाः साङ्गास्तथैकत्र भारतं चैकतः स्थितम् ॥ स्वर्गारोहणपर्व 5. 45-46.

1340. इत्येतन्मात्स्यकं नाम पुराणं परिकीर्तितम् । वनपर्व 187. 57 (= cr. ed. 185. 53); सर्वलोकस्य विदिता युगसंख्या च पाण्डव । एतत् ते सर्वमाख्यातमतीतानागतं तथा । वायुप्रोक्तमनुस्मृत्य पुराणमृषिसंस्तुतम् ॥ वनपर्व 191. 15-16 (= cr. ed. 189. 14).

1341. का पुनरियं देवता नाम । एकं तावन्मतं या एता इतिहासपुराणेष्वग्न्याद्याः संकीर्त्यन्ते नाकसदस्ता देवता इति । ...येषु देवताशब्दो मन्त्रब्राह्मणे श्रूयते अग्निर्देवता वातो देवता सूर्यो देवता चन्द्रमा देवता इत्येवमादिषु तेऽत्र देवताशब्देनोच्यन्ते इति । ...तस्मात्स्वक- भावो हविर्भाजश्च देवताः । शबर on जै. X. 4. 23.

1342. पुराणे वायुप्रलपितम् । काद० पूर्वभाग para 37; पुराणमिव यथाविभागावस्थापित- सकलभुवनकोशम् । काद० पूर्वभाग para 85 (राजकुलं). The वायुपुराण itself states that the Sūta narrated to the sages in the Naimiṣa forest the Purāṇa first

(*Continued on next page*)

cription of the palace of Tārāpīḍa Bāṇa employs a śleṣa (*double extendre*) comparing it with Purāṇa (the two meanings being 'where the accumulated wealth of the world was arranged in appropriate groups', 'in which there is a description of the whole sphere of worlds each part of which was assigned a proper division'). In the Uttarabhāga (by the son of Bāṇa) of the Kādambarī it is stated that in all āgamas (sacred works traditionally handed down) such as Purāṇas, Rāmāyaṇa and Bhārata there are many stories about curses. The placing of Purāṇas first shows that they were probably more honoured or popular than the Rāmāyaṇa and the Bhārata. In the Harṣacarita[1343] it is stated that the book-reader Sudṛṣṭi treated Bāṇa and his relatives and friends to a musical recitation of the Purāṇa promulgated by Vāyu, that was sung by the sage (Vyāsa), that is very extensive, that is world-wide (i. e. known everywhere), that is holy and that is not different from the career of Harṣa (to which also all the adjectives applied to the Purāṇa are applicable). Here it appears that the Vāyu is expressly mentioned (as *Pavamānaprokta* and *Pāvana*) and it is further stated that the Purāṇas contained a description of the several divisions of the world. This description applies to such Purāṇas as the Vāyu, Matsya (chapters 114–128), Brahmāṇḍa (II. 15 ff). It may be argued that the Purāṇa mentioned by Bāṇa may be the Brahmāṇḍa since that Purāṇa says[1343a] in the beginning as well as at the end (IV. 4. 58ff) that Brahmā imparted it to Vāyu, from whom it passed on to several divine and semi-divine personages and ultimately sūta received it from Vyāsa. This latter argument is not acceptable, since there was nothing to prevent Bāṇa from expressly saying that the Brahmāṇḍa was the Purāṇa recited by Sudṛṣṭi.

(Continued from last page)

promulgated by Vāyu (I. 47–48 पुराणं संप्रवक्ष्यामि यदुक्तं मातरिश्वना। पृष्टेन मुनिभिः पूर्वं नैमिषीयैर्महात्मभिः ॥). Chapters 34–49 of the वायुपुराण contain भुवनविन्यास; आगमेषु सर्वेष्वेव पुराणरामायणभारतादिषु सम्यगनेकप्रकाराः शापवार्ताः। कादम्बरी, उत्तरभाग (शुकनास's consoling speech to king Tārāpīḍa on hearing of the heart-break of Candrāpīḍa).

1343. पुस्तकवाचकः सुदृष्टिः···गीत्या पवमानप्रोक्तं पुराणं पपाठ। हर्षचरित III, 4th para; the आर्या verse applicable to both is 'तदपि मुनिगीतमतिपृथु तदपि जगद्व्यापि पावनं तदपि। हर्षचरितादभिन्नं प्रतिभाति हि मे पुराणमिदम्॥ हर्ष॰ III, 5th para. पवन means वायु and so पावन may stand for वायवीय.

1343 a. पुराणं संप्रवक्ष्यामि यदुक्तं मातरिश्वना। पृष्टेन मुनिभिः पूर्वं नैमिषीयैर्महात्मभिः॥ ब्रह्माण्ड I. 1, 36–37.

Kumārilabhaṭṭa in his Tantravārtika refers in several places to the Purāṇas and their contents. A few interesting passages are set out here: On *Jaimini I. 3. 1* Kumārila says[1344] 'Therefore the authoritativeness of all smṛtis is established by the purpose which they serve; whatever therein (in smṛtis) is connected with *dharma* and *mokṣa* (is authoritative), because it springs from (is based on) the Veda; whatever concerns wealth (artha) and pleasures is based on the usages of the people. In this way a distinction is to be made. This very reasoning applies to hortatory passages in the Itihāsa and Purāṇas. The Upākhyānas may be explained by the reasoning applicable to arthavādas (i. e. they have a purpose and authoritativeness just like the commendatory passages of the Veda). Narration of the divisions of the earth serves the purpose of distinguishing the regions for undergoing the consequences of the (actions that are the) means of dharma and adharma and are partly based on personal experience and partly on the Veda. The orderly presentation of vaṁśas (dynasties) in the Purāṇas is intended to facilitate the knowledge of the brāhmaṇa and kṣatriya castes and their gotras and is based on actual experience and traditional knowledge; countries and measures of time are intended to facilitate worldly transactions and astronomical needs and are based on actual perception, mathematics, tradition and inference. The narration of what will happen in the future is based on the Veda, since it conveys knowledge of the variety of the ripening of the consequences of (complying with) *dharma* and of *adharma* and knowledge of the characteristics of *yugas* that have been in operation from time immemorial.' It is clear from this passage that the Itihāsa and the Purāṇas that Kumārila knew contained stories, geography of the earth, dynastic lists, measures of time and description of what will happen in the future. These are matters dealt with in the extant Purāṇas. On Jaimini I. 3. 7 Kumārila observes: 'In the

---

1344. तेन सर्वस्मृतीनां प्रयोजनवती प्रामाण्यसिद्धिः। तत्र यावद्धर्ममोक्षसम्बन्धि तद्वेदप्रभवम्। यत्त्वर्थसुखविषयं तल्लोकव्यवहारपूर्वकमिति विवेक्तव्यम्। एषैवेतिहासपुराणयोरप्युपदेशवाक्यानां गतिः। उपाख्यानानि त्वर्थवादेषु व्याख्यातानि। यत्तु पृथिवीविभागकथनं तद्धर्माधर्मसाधनफलोपभोगप्रदेशविवेकाय किंचिद्दर्शनपूर्वकं किंचिद्वेदमूलम्। वंशानुक्रमणमपि ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियजातिगोत्रज्ञानार्थं दर्शनस्मरणमूलम्। देशकालपरिमाणमपि लोकज्योतिःशास्त्रव्यवहारसिद्ध्यर्थं दर्शनगणितसंप्रदायानुमानपूर्वकम्। भाविकथनमपि त्वनादिकालप्रवृत्तयुगस्वभावधर्माधर्मानुष्ठानफलविपाकवैचित्र्यज्ञानद्वारेण वेदमूलम्। तन्त्रवार्तिक on जै. I. 3. 1 (धर्मस्य शब्दमूलत्वादशब्दमनपेक्षं स्यात्).

Purāṇas [1345] it is narrated that in the Kali age there will arise Śākya (Gautama Buddha) and others that will cause confusion about *dharma*; who would listen to their words?' This shows that before the 7th century A. D. the Purāṇas contained descriptions of the nature of Kaliyuga and that the Purāṇas Kumārila knew did not regard Buddha as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, but rather condemned him. From the facts that Kṣemendra composed his Daśāvatāracarita in 1066 A. D., that Aparārka (on p. 338) quotes a long passage from the Matsya chapter 285, verse seven of which enumerates the ten avatāras of Viṣṇu (including Buddha), and that the Gītagovinda of Jayadeva regards Buddha as an avatāra, it follows that before 1000 A. D. Buddha had come to be regarded as an avatāra of Viṣṇu, though before the 7th century some Purāṇas at least had condemned him. In the discussion of the meaning of the word 'svarga' [1346] Kumārila asks: does it mean the region of the stars or does it mean the top of the Meru (mountain) in conformity with Itihāsa and Purāṇas or does it mean only a state of happiness? This indicates that in Kumārila's day Purāṇas contained descriptions of the top of Meru as 'heaven.'

Śaṅkarācārya in his bhāṣya on the Vedāntasūtra frequently mentions the contents and characteristic features of Purāṇas that are the same as those of the extant ones, though he actually names none of them. For example, on V. S. II. 1. 36 he remarks that it has been established in the Purāṇa that there is no limit to the number of past and future [1347] *kalpas*. On V. S. I. 3.30.

1345. स्मर्यन्ते च पुराणेषु धर्मविप्लुतिहेतवः। कलौ शाक्यादयस्तेषां को वाक्यं श्रोतुमर्हति॥ तन्त्रवार्तिक p. 203 on जै. I. 3.7; some of the Purāṇas such as Varāha 113. 27-28, Brahma 122. 68-70, Padma VI. 31. 13-15 mention the ten avatāras of Viṣṇu (including Buddha). But these Purāṇas have been swollen by late interpolations and it is impossible to give a positive date for these passages.

1346. तथा स्वर्गशब्देनापि नक्षत्रदेशो वा वैदिकप्रवादपौराणिकयाज्ञिकदर्शनेनोच्यते ...यदि वेतिहासपुराणोपपन्नं मेरुपृष्ठम्, अथवा अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां विभक्तं केवलमेव सुखम् ...। तन्त्रवार्तिक p. 299 on जै. I. 3. 30. That gods and semi-divine beings dwell on the top of Meru is stated in many Purāṇas. Vide मत्स्य 11. 37-38, पद्म V. 8. 72-73.

1347. पुराणे चातीतानागतानां कल्पानां न परिमाणमस्तीति स्थापितम्। last line of भाष्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 36; vide ब्रह्माण्ड I. 4. 30-32 for कल्प्s being endless; स्मृतिश्च भवति। तेषां ये यानि कर्माणि प्राक्सृष्ट्यां प्रतिपेदिरे। तान्येव ते प्रपद्यन्ते सृज्यमानाः पुनः पुनः। हिंस्राहिंस्रे मृदुक्रूरे धर्माधर्मावृतानृते। तद्भाविताः प्रपद्यन्ते तस्मात्तत्तस्य रोचते॥ भाष्य on I. 3. 30; these are विष्णुपु० I. 6. 59-60 and वायु 8. 32-33 and repeated in 9.

(*Continued on next page*)

the Ācārya quotes two verses that he designates as smṛti, that are Viṣṇupurāṇa I. 5. 59–60, but are not found in ancient smṛtis like those of Manu or Yāj. On V. S. III. 1. 15 (api ca sapta) the bhāṣya remarks that those who have studied or who know the Purāṇas declare that there are seven hells, Raurava and others, that are regarded as places reached for undergoing the consequences of evil deeds committed by sinners. The Viṣṇupurāṇa enumerates seven hells viz. Tāmisra, Raurava and others, as the places for those who abuse the Veda, who cause *obstacles to* sacrifices and who give up their proper dharma. Even Manu (IV. 87–90), Yāj. (III. 222–224), Viṣṇu Dh. S. 43. 2–22 enumerate 21 hells and almost all Purāṇas mention 21 or more hells. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 162–164. On V. S. I. 3. 26 and 33 the bhāṣya says that one can see from Vedic mantras, arthavāda passages, Itihāsa and Purāṇa and popular belief that gods have bodies. On V. S. II. 1. 1. Śaṅkarācārya quotes a verse which is the same in Vāyupurāṇa and on I. 3. 30 quotes in all five verses as smṛti, four of which are the same as Vāyu 9. 57–58 and 64–65. Viśvarūpa in his commentary on the Yājñavalkya-smṛti has two interesting notes on Purāṇas. On Yāj. III. 170 which describes the Sāṅkhya theory of the evolution of the world, Viśvarūpa[1348]

(Continued from last page)

57–58. Only the half verse हिंस्राहिंस्रे॰ *is found in* मनु *I. 29; these verses are* also found in शान्ति 232. 16–17; अपि च सप्त नरका रौरवप्रमुखा दुष्कृतफलोपभोगभूमित्वेन स्मर्यन्ते पौराणिकैः। ताननिष्टादिकारिणः प्राप्नुवन्ति। भाष्य on वे. सू. III. 1. 15; तथा सामर्थ्यमपि (देवादीनां) सम्भवति मन्त्रार्थवादेतिहासपुराणलोकेभ्यो विग्रहवत्त्वावगमात्। भाष्य on I. 3. 26; इतिहासपुराणमपि व्याख्यातेन मार्गेण सम्भवन्मन्त्रार्थवादमूलत्वात्प्रभवति देवताविग्रहादि साधयितुम्। ...तथा च व्यासादयो देवादिभिः प्रत्यक्षं व्यवहरन्तीति स्मर्यते। भाष्य I. 3. 33; अतश्च सङ्क्षेपमिमं शृणुध्वं नारायणः सर्वमिदं पुराणः। स सर्गकाले च करोति सर्वं संहारकाले च तदत्ति भूयः॥ इति पुराणे। भाष्य on II. 1. 1. This is वायु I. 205 which reads महेश्वरः for नारायणः. On वे. सू. I. 3. 30 the भाष्य quotes three verses as स्मृति, the first two of which are the same as वायु. 9. 64–65 (viz. ऋषीणां नामधेयानि and यथर्तावृतुलिङ्गानि). It appears probable that शङ्कराचार्य quotes from the वायु most of these verses, as he expressly says about one of them (viz. अतश्च &c.) that it is from a पुराण.

1348. एषा प्रक्रिया सृष्टिप्रलयवर्णनादौ सर्वत्र पुराणादिष्वपि &c.। विश्वरूप's बालक्रीडा on या. III. 170; पुराणे हि भगवतः सवितुर्दक्षिणतो वीथ्यो दिवि पठ्यन्ते श्रूयन्ते तत्रागस्त्यस्यान्तरा अजवीथी। बालक्रीडा on या. III. 175. For सांख्यप्रक्रिया in पुराणs, vide प्रधानं प्रकृतिश्चेति यमाहुस्तत्त्वचिन्तकाः। ...प्रादुरासीन्महद्बीजं प्रधानपुरुषात्मकम्। ...त्रिविधोयमहंकारो महतः सम्बभूव ह। ...पञ्चभूतान्यहंकारात्तन्मात्राणि च जज्ञिरे। कूर्म I.4. 6, 16, 18, 19 and विष्णु I. 20.29–37. या. III. 175 is पितृयानोऽजवीथ्याश्च यदगस्त्यस्य चान्तरम्। तेनाग्निहोत्रिणो यान्ति स्वर्गकामा दिवं प्रति॥ Compare for a striking resemblance विष्णुपु॰ II. 8. 85–86 उत्तरं यदगस्त्यस्य अजवीथ्याश्च दक्षिणम्। पितृयानः स

(Continued on next page)

remarks that this theory concerning the creation and dissolution of the world is found everywhere in the Purāṇas. On Yāj. III. 175 which states that the path to the world of the pitṛs lies between the star Agastya (Canopus) and the Ajavīthi, Viśvarūpa remarks that in the Purāṇa several *vīthis* (i. e. courses) of the Sun in the sky are found and that Ajavīthi is immediately contiguous to Agastya.

From the foregoing discussion about the references to Purāṇas contained in writers from Śabara to Viśvarūpa it follows that between about the 2nd century AD. and the 6th or 7th century AD. the Purāṇas exhibited the same contents and characteristics as many of the extant Purāṇas do.

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to say here something about the Yuga-purāṇa, a part of the Gārgī-Saṁhitā, and one of the earliest extant works bearing the title Purāṇas. Kern in his Introduction to the Bṛhatsaṁhitā (pp. 32–40) brought this rare Purāṇa containing valuable historical data to the notice of scholars from a fragmentary ms. Later on K. P. Jayaswal[1348a] published a text of the purely historical material of the Yugapurāṇa in 115 half lines in Anuṣṭubh metre based on the fragment that Kern had got and two more mss. that were secured by him and added a translation and notes. Later on Jayaswal obtained a copy made by Prof. Levi from a ms. (in Bengali script) in the Bibliotheque Nationale of Paris and published in JBORS. (vol. XV pp. 129–133) a table comparing the readings of that ms. with the text he published in JBORS. vol. XIV. Prof. K. H. Dhruva contributed a paper on the text of the Yugapurāṇa to the JBORS. vol. XVI. pp. 18-66, wherein he altered the proper names and gave free scope to his conjectures and inferences with the result that succeeding scholars have not attached any weight to his emendations and remarks. Prof. D. K. Mankad[1348b] published a monograph in which he gave the text of the historical portion based on the mss. utilized

---

(*Continued from last page*)

वै पन्था वैश्वानरपथाद्बहिः॥ तत्रासते महात्मान ऋषयो येऽग्निहोत्रिणः।. विश्वरूप *obviously* refers to this passage of the विष्णुपुराण or a similar passage in some other Purāṇa such as मत्स्य *124. 53–60*, वायु *50. 130*. अजवीथि *is one of the three divi*sions of the southern path in the sky in which the Sun, the Moon and planets move, comprehending मूल, पूर्वाषाढा and उत्तराषाढा नक्षत्रs.

1348 a. Vide JBORS vol. XIV. pp. 397–421 on 'Historical data in the Gargasaṁhitā and the Brahmin Empire'.

1348 b. Charutar Prakashan, Vallabhavidyā-nagar, 1951.

by Jayaswal and a fresh ms. that he obtained in Saurāṣṭra, corrects some of the readings accepted by Jayaswal and considerably differs from some of Jayaswal's interpretations and added a few notes.

The Yugapurāṇa is the 113th chapter of Gārgīsaṁhitā and is called Skandapurāṇa in the ms. secured by Prof. Mankad, probably because the Purāṇa starts with a question by Skanda to Śiva about the characteristics of the different *yugas*. The characteristics of Kṛta, Tretā and Dvāpara are respectively described in lines 11–28, 29–45 and 46–74 of Prof. Mankad's text; and lines 75–235 (of Prof. Mankad's text) and lines 1–115 of Jayaswal's text (in JBORS. vol. XIV. pp. 400-408) describe the characteristics of the Kaliyuga, and the political, social and economic history of a few centuries before the work was composed. The characteristics of the Kaliyuga in the Yugapurāṇa bear a very close resemblance to the description of Kaliyuga in the Vanaparva (chap. 188. 30–64), one half verse being the same in both.[1348c]

The important points that emerge are briefly these:—I omit the discussion of different interpretations of Jayaswal, Prof. Mankad and Prof. Narain. Kaliyuga started after Draupadī died. In the beginning of Kaliyuga Janamejaya, son of Parīkṣit, would be a famous king but will come in conflict[1348d] with brāhmaṇas. In Kaliyuga, Udāyi son of Śiśunāga, will found the city of Pāṭaliputra on the south bank of the Ganges, which will come to be called Puṣpapura and which will last for five thousand, five hundred and five years, five months, five days and five muhūrtas. In that Puṣpapura there will be a deluded and wicked king called Śāliśūka who will establish at Sāketa his virtuous elder brother named Vijaya. Then the valiant Yavanas,

---

1348c. The passage from Vanaparva 188. 30–64 is quoted in the 3rd vol. of H. of Dh. pp. 1012–13. The half verse is भोवादिनस्तथा शूद्रा ब्राह्मणाश्चार्यवादिनः । वनपर्व 188.39, line 38 of Jayaswal's text and 110 of Prof. Mankad's text (reads ब्राह्मणाश्चार्यवादिनः, which does not appear correct and yields hardly any sense). Compare Yugapurāṇa (lines 111–115 of Jayaswal and ll. 182–186 of Prof. Mankad's text with Vanaparva 188. 65–66.

1348d. For the story of this quarrel, vide Matsya-purāṇa 50. 56–65. One half line is variously read 'dharma-mītatamā vṛddhā janam bhokṣyanti nirbhayāḥ' (Jayaswal l. 40); Prof. Mankad reads 'dharmabhītatamā vṛddhā janam mokṣyanti nirbhayāḥ'. Jayaswal thinks that 'dharmamīta' refers to the Greek king Demetrius. Prof. Mankad does not agree.

Pañcalas and Māthuras will attack Sāketa and will conquer Kusumapura which had a mud fortification. All countries will be disturbed (by this onslaught of the Yavanas). Then non-Aryans will follow the practices of the Aryas. At the end of Kali age brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas, vaiśyas will dress alike and have the same practices. People will join heretical sects and will make friends for (seducing their) wives. Śūdras will offer oblations into fire with the syllable 'om' and they will address (others) with the word 'bhoḥ' and brāhmaṇas will address others with the words 'O āryas'. The Yavanas will establish five kings in the city (of Puṣpapura). The Yavanas will not stay long in Madhyadeśa. When the Yavanas will vanish there will be seven powerful kings at Sāketa; in Madhyadeśa there would be bloody wars. All the Āgniveśya kings will perish by war and so will the people.

Thereafter the greedy Śaka king will undergo destruction against Sāta, the king of Kaliṅga, and the earth will be devastated and Puṣpapura will be a wilderness. Amlāta called 'red-eyed' will secure Puṣpapura. The Mleccha king Amlāta will destroy the helpless people and the four varṇas. Amlāta with his relatives will perish and then there will be a king called Gopāla who will rule one year and then die. There will then be the just king called Puṣyaka who will rule only one year. After two more kings, Agnimitra will be king who will wage a terrible battle with brāhmaṇas for a girl. After him his son will rule for 20 years. The condition of the people will be very bad because of his fight with Śabaras. Then Sātu king will rule. Then there will be depredations of Śakas who will destroy one-fourth of the population and make the people demoralised. In this way the Yugapurāṇa ends on a dismal note.[1348 e]

As the Purāṇa stops with the Śakas and does not dilate on the dynasties of the Andhras, Ābhīras and Guptas, it must be placed earlier than all the known Purāṇas which deal with these dynasties. Jayaswal places the Yugapurāṇa in the latter half of the first century B. C. In the opinion of the present author he is right.

1348 e. देवो द्वादश वर्षाणि अनावृष्टिं करिष्यति। प्रजा नाशं गमिष्यन्ति दुर्भिक्षभयपीडिताः। ततः पापक्षते लोके दुर्भिक्षे रोमहर्षणे। भविष्यति युगस्यान्ते सर्वप्राणिविनाशनम्। जनमारस्ततो घोरो भविष्यति न संशयः॥ युगपुराण; तस्मिन्युगसहस्रान्ते संमासे चायुषः क्षये। अनावृष्टिर्महाराज जायते बहुवार्षिकी॥ ततस्तान्यल्पसाराणि सत्त्वानि क्षुधितानि वै। प्रलयं यान्ति भूयिष्ठं पृथिव्यां पृथिवीपते॥ वनपर्व 188. 65-66.

A very recent work 'The Indo-Greeks' by Prof. A. K. Narain (Oxford, 1957) has an illuminating note (pp. 174–179) on several difficult passages of the Yugapurāṇa[1348f].

Several Purāṇas such as Matsya 53. 3–11, Vāyu I. 60–61, Brahmāṇḍa I. 1.40-41, Liṅga I. 2.2, Nāradīya I. 92. 22–26, Padma V. 1. 45–52 state that Purāṇa[1349] was originally only one, that Brahmā thought of it first, that after that the Vedas proceeded from Brahmā's lips, that originally it had the extent of one hundred crores of ślokas and that the essence thereof to the extent of four lakhs of verses was declared in each Dvāpara age by Vyāsa. It is impossible to say whether the writers of the extant Purāṇas had any ancient tradition about this before them or whether all this about the original existence of a single Purāṇa was purely imaginary. The author holds that the latter view is more likely to be the correct one. It has been shown above that as early as the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka Purāṇas are mentioned in the plural. Therefore, the extant Purāṇas are only the successors of the ancient Purāṇas, about which, it must be admitted, we know very little.

The number of Purāṇas (in later times and by some of the Purāṇas distinguished as Mahāpurāṇas) has been traditionally handed down as eighteen. They are enumerated in several Purāṇas, such as Viṣṇu III. 6. 21–23, Varāha 112. 69–72 (verses 74–77 in Venk. ed.), Liṅga I. 39. 61–63, Matsya 53. 11 ff, Padma IV. 100. 51–54, Bhaviṣya I. 1. 61–64, Mārkaṇḍeya 134. 7–11,

---

1348 f. Vide Appendix I on 'yavana' and 'yona' (pp. 165–169) in Prof. Narain's 'Indo-Greeks.' He points out that in Karṇaparva (45. 36) Yavanas are described as all-knowing (sarvajña), valiant and different from mlecchas.

1349. पुराणं सर्वशास्त्राणां प्रथमं ब्रह्मणा स्मृतम्। अनन्तरं च वक्त्रेभ्यो वेदास्तस्य विनिर्गताः। पुराणमेकमेवासीत्तदा कल्पान्तरेऽनघ। त्रिवर्गसाधनं पुण्यं शतकोटिप्रविस्तरम्। प्रवृत्तिः सर्वशास्त्राणां पुराणस्याभवत्ततः। कालेनाग्रहणं दृष्ट्वा पुराणस्य ततो नृप॥ व्यासरूपमहं कृत्वा संहरामि युगे युगे। चतुर्लक्षप्रमाणेन द्वापरे द्वापरे सदा। तदष्टादशधा कृत्वा भूर्लोकेऽस्मिन् प्रकाश्यते। अद्यापि देवलोकेऽस्मिन् शतकोटिप्रविस्तरम्। तदर्थोऽत्र चतुर्लक्षं संक्षेपेण निवेशितम्। पुराणानि दशाष्टौ च साम्प्रतं तदिहोच्यते। मत्स्य 53. 3–11; पद्म (V. 1. 45–52) contains almost all the above verses of मत्स्य. The first verse occurs in वायु I. 60–61 and ब्रह्माण्ड I. 1. 40–41. The ब्रह्मपुराण 245. 4 says 'आद्यं ब्राह्माभिधानं च सर्ववाञ्छाफलप्रदम्'. The विष्णुपुराण III. 6. 20 states 'आद्यं सर्वपुराणानां पुराणं ब्राह्ममुच्यते.' The देवीभागवत I. 3. 3 put मत्स्य as the first.

Agni 272, Bhāgavata[1350] XII. 13. 4–8, Vāyu[1351] 104. 2–10, Skanda (Prabhāsakhaṇḍa 2. 5–7). There is some difference about the 18 names and great difference as to their extent and contents. The Matsya (53. 18–19), Agni 272. 4–5, Nāradīya I. 92. 26–28 enumerate the Vāyu as the 4th among the 18 Purāṇas, while most of the others substitute Śivapurāṇa as the 4th in place of the Vāyu. The Skanda (in Prabhāsakhaṇḍa 2. 5 and 7) puts Śaiva as the 4th in place of Vāyu and Vāyavīya as the last (probably meaning Brahmāṇḍa thereby). The Devībhāgavata[1352] contains a verse naming the 18 Purāṇas by their first letters in which the Śivapurāṇa is omitted. The Saurapurāṇa (chap. 9. 5–12) enumerates the 18 Purāṇas, places Vāyu as the 4th (and not Śiva) and Brahmāṇḍa as the last. The Sūtasaṁhitā (I. 1. 7–11) names the 18 Purāṇas omitting Vāyu and putting Śivapurāṇa in its place. The Dānasāgara in its Introductory verses (11–12 on pp. 2–3) mentions both Vāyavīya and Śaiva separately. In the verses of the Kālikā-purāṇa quoted by Hemādri on dāna I. p. 531, Śiva, Kālikā, Saura and Vahnija (Āgneya, the genuine one) are included among eighteen principal Purāṇas. On the whole I agree with Dr. A. D. Pusalkar[1353] that it is the Vāyu that is entitled to be regarded as one of the 18 principal Purāṇas and not the Śivapurāṇa. Al-beruni in his work on India (com-

---

1350. The भागवत says 'मुनयोऽष्टादश प्राहुः क्षुल्लकानि महान्ति च ।' XII, 7. 220. The late ब्रह्मवैवर्त (IV. 131. 7–10) states that the five characteristics mentioned in note 1365 distinguish the Upapurāṇas, while the ten characteristics quoted in note 1366 distinguish the महापुराणs. विष्णु० III. 6. 13 uses the word महापुराणानि.

1351. Vāyu 104 is a chapter of doubtful authority. Several mss, of Vāyu do not contain it. chap. 104. 7 mentions Vāyu as Anilapurāṇa. Vāyu (104. 2–10) furnishes a list of 18 Purāṇas in which Brahma and Ādika are both included, but no names of Upapurāṇas are given therein.

1352. मद्वयं भद्वयं चैव ब्रत्रयं वचतुष्टयम् । अनापलिंगकूस्कानि पुराणानि पृथक् पृथक् ॥ देवीभागवत I 3. 2. मद्वय = मत्स्य, मार्कण्डेय; भद्वय = भविष्य, भागवत; ब्रत्रय = ब्रह्म, ब्रह्मवैवर्त, ब्रह्माण्ड; वचतुष्टय = वराह, वामन, वायु, विष्णु; अ, ना, प, लिं, ग respectively stand for अग्नि, नारदीय, पद्म, लिङ्ग, गरुड; कू = कूर्म; स्क = स्कन्द. Wilson in Preface to tr. of Viṣṇu at p. XXIV states that his ms. of Varāha omits the Garuḍa and Brahmāṇḍa from the list of 18 Purāṇas and inserts Vāyu and Narasiṁha. The ms. is singular in this respect. The printed Varāha (chap. 112. 69 in the B. I. and verse 74 in Veṅk. ed.) only puts Śaiva for Vāyu; that is all.

1353. Vide 'Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas of India' by Dr. A. D. Pusalkar (Vidya Bhavan Series, Bombay, 1955) chap. 2, pp. 31–41. The Matsya (53. 18–19) mentions what the Vāyupurāṇa contained.

posed in 1030 A. D.) sets out one list of Purāṇas as read out to him from Viṣṇupurāṇa, which is the same as set out below, except this that the Śaiva-purāṇa is put in the 4th place instead of Vāyu (Sachau's tr. vol. I. p. 131, ed. of 1888). It is clear, therefore. that the list of 18 principal Purāṇas had been completed long before 1000 A. D. and was introduced in the Viṣṇupurāṇa many years before that date. Al-beruni furnishes (*ibid* p. 130) another list of the names of 18 Purāṇas which he had heard, viz. Ādi, Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Narasiṁha, Vāmana, Vāyu, Nanda, Skanda, Āditya, Soma, Sāmba, Brahmāṇḍa, Mārkaṇḍeya, Tārkṣya (i. e. Garuḍa), Viṣṇu, Brahma, Bhaviṣya. It should be noticed that in this list Vāyu is included (and not Śaiva), that some purāṇas described in other works as Upapurāṇas are included (viz. Ādi, Narasiṁha, Nanda, Āditya, Soma and Sāmba) and some works almost unanimously declared to be Mahāpurāṇas (such as Padma, Bhāgavata, Nārada, Agni, Liṅga and Brahmavaivarta) are omitted. It follows that some upapurāṇas such as Ādi, Narasiṁha, Āditya, Sāmba, Nanda (Nandī?) had been composed at least some time before 1000 A. D. Bālambhaṭṭa (latter half of 18th century A. D.) states in his commentary on the Mitākṣarā (on Yāj. I. 3) that the Vāyavīya-purāṇa is also called Śaiva.

The following is a table of the 18 principal Purāṇas together with information about the number of ślokas in each.

Order	Name of Purāṇa	Number of verses acc. to Matsya, Vāyu 104 and some others	Number of verses acc. to some other Purāṇas and remarks
1	Brahma	10000 (acc. to Nārada 92.31 and Bhāgavata XII. 13.4)	25000 acc. to Agni 272. 1
2	Padma	55,000	
3	Viṣṇu	23,000	The number of verses is given from 6 to 24 thousand in various works.
4	Vāyu	24,000	14000 acc. to Agni (272. 4–5), 24600 acc. to Devībhāgavata I. 3. 7.
5	Bhāgavata	18,000	

Order	Name of Purāṇa	Number of verses acc. to Matsya, Vāyu 104 and some others	Number of verses acc. to some other Purāṇas and remarks
6	Nāradīya	25,000	
7	Mārkaṇḍeya	9,000	6900 acc. to Mārkaṇḍeya itself (134. 39), 9000 acc. to Nārada I. 98.2, Vāyu 104.4
8	Agni	16,000	15400 acc. to Bhāgavata XII. 13.5, 12000 acc. to Agni (272. 10-11).
9	Bhaviṣya	14,500	14000 acc. to Agni (272. 12)
10	Brahmavaivarta	18,000	
11	Liṅga	11,000	
12	Varāha	24,000	
13	Skanda	81,100	84000 acc. to Agni (272. 17), vide below under Sknda.
14	Vāmana	10,000	
15	Kūrma	18,000	17000 acc. to Nārada I. 106. 3 and Bhāgavata XII. 13. 8; 8000 acc. to Agni. 272. 19,
16	Matsya	14,000	13000 acc. to Agni 272. 20-21
17	Garuḍa	18,000	19000 acc. to Bhāgavata XII. 13.8 and Devībhāgavata I. 3; 8000 acc. to Agni 272.21
18	Brahmāṇḍa	12,200 acc. to Matsya 53. 54	12000 acc. to Bhāgavata (XII. 13-8 and Agni 272.23)

It will be noticed from the table that the total number of verses in the 18 Purāṇas according to the figures furnished by most Purāṇas comes to 400600 ślokas. This closely agrees with the total of four lakhs assigned to the eighteen Purāṇas in some of the Purāṇas (vide note 1349 above). But several of the extant Purāṇas contain much smaller numbers of ślokas than are assigned to them. For example, it appears from the commentaries called Viṣṇucittī[1354] and Vaiṣṇavākūtācandrikā on

1354. विष्णुपुराणं च कचिद्दशसाहस्रं कचिद्दसाहस्रमित्यादिविकल्पेऽप्यत्र षट्साहस्रमेव व्याख्यायते। वैष्णवाकूतचन्द्रिका of रत्नगर्भभट्ट on विष्णुपु० III. 6. 23; the वान-

(*Continued on next page*)

Viṣṇupurāṇa III. 6. 23 that the estimates of the extent of the Viṣṇupurāṇa varied from 6, 8, 9, 10, 22, 23 to 24 thousand ślokas and that both the commentaries comment on a text of the Viṣṇupurāṇa that has only 6000 ślokas. Similarly, the extent of the Kūrma is said to be 17000 or 18000 ślokas by most of the Purāṇas that furnish the extent of Purāṇas, but the extant Kūrma has hardly 6000 ślokas. The Brahma contains 10000 ślokas according to the Nāradīya and 25000 according to the Agni, but the printed Brahma (of the Anandāśrama ed.) contains about 14000 verses. On the other hand, the Skanda (that has two recensions at present) is said to contain 81000 ślokas, but the Skanda printed by the Venk. Press contains several thousands more. The Bhaviṣya (Brāhmaparva)[1355] states that all Purāṇas had originally 12000 verses each, but their extent increased by the addition of tales, so that the Skanda was inflated to the extent of one lakh of ślokas and the Bhaviṣya to 50000 ślokas. The order in which the Purāṇas are enumerated is not quite uniform. Most Purāṇas put the Brāhma in[1356] the first place and set out the order as in the table above, yet the Vāyu (104. 3) and the Devībhāgavata (I. 3. 3) begin the list of Purāṇas with Matsya. The Skanda (Prabhāsa-khaṇḍa 2. 8–9) puts the Brahmāṇḍa in the first place. The Bhāgavata (XII. 7. 23–24) enumerates the eighteen Purāṇas in a somewhat different order. The Vāmana[1357] regards the

---

(Continued from last page)

सागर (p. 7, verse 63) notes that there was a ब्रह्मपुराण of 23000 ślokas and a लिङ्गपुराण of 6000. The विष्णुचित्तीया says 'वैष्णवं तु बहुभेदं तेन पुराणान्तरेषु वैष्णवस्य दशसाहस्राष्टसाहस्राद्युक्तं संहिताभेदमानविषया कल्प्याः। यथा लैङ्गे। '''शैवमात्स्ययोस्तु वैष्णवं चाष्टसाहस्रमिति। क्वचिद्देशे नवसाहस्रं दृश्यते क्वचिच्चतुर्विंशतिसहस्रं क्वचिद् द्वाविंशतिसहस्रम्। इदं तु षट्सहस्रमस्माभिर्व्याख्यायमानम् ॥. The दानसागर passage is (p. 7 verses 63–64) 'तार्क्ष्यं पुराणमपरं ब्राह्ममाग्नेयमेव च। त्रयोविंशतिसाहस्रं पुराणमपि वैष्णवम्॥ षट्-सहस्रमितं लैङ्गं पुराणमपरं तथा। '''लोकवञ्चनमालोक्य सर्वमेवावधीरितम्॥'

1355. सर्वाण्येव पुराणानि संज्ञेयानि नरर्षभ। द्वादशैव सहस्राणि प्रोक्तानीह मनीषिभिः॥ पुनर्वृद्धिं गतानीह आख्यानैर्विविधैर्नृप। यथा स्कान्दं तथा चेदं भविष्यं कुरुनन्दन॥ स्कान्दं शतसहस्रं तु लोकानां ज्ञातमेव हि। भविष्यमेतद्राजेन्द्र लक्षार्धं संख्यया कृतम्॥ भविष्य (ब्राह्म-पर्व) I. 103–105.

1356. The विष्णु says for example: 'आद्यं सर्वपुराणानां पुराणं ब्राह्ममुच्यते। अष्टादश पुराणानि पुराणज्ञाः प्रचक्षते॥ विष्णु III. 6. 18; तेपि श्रुत्वा मुनिश्रेष्ठाः पुराणं वेद-संमितम्। आद्यं ब्राह्माभिधानं च सर्ववाञ्छाफलप्रदम्॥ ब्रह्म 245. 4.

1357. मुख्यं पुराणेषु यथैव मात्स्यं स्वायम्भुवोक्तिस्त्वथ संहितासु। मनुः स्मृतीनां प्रवरो यथैव तिथीषु दर्शो विबुधेषु वासवः॥ वामनपुराण 12. 48. It may be noted that the Matsyapurāṇa chapter (53 verses 3–4 and 11–57) describing the extent and summaries of the 18 Purāṇas are quoted by Aparārka pp. 392–396 and the Dānasāgara pp. 463–469.

Matsya as the foremost among Purāṇas.) Notices of the contents of all the 18 Purāṇas occur in Matsya (chap. 53), Agni (chap. 272), Skanda (Prabhāsakhaṇḍa 2. 28-76), Nāradīya (which devotes 18 chapters from I. 92. 30-43 to I. 109 to the contents of 18 Purāṇas from Brahma to Brahmāṇḍa). There is almost complete agreement among the Purāṇas as to the names of the 18 principal Purāṇas, except as to the Vāyupurāṇa.

The question about the Purāṇas is further complicated by the fact that some of the Purāṇas themselves mention the names of a number of Upapurāṇas, though others ignore them. For example, the Matsya (53. 59-62) names the Nārasiṁha, the Nandi, the Āditya and Sāmba as Upapurāṇas and appears to say that the Nārasiṁha extended to 18000 ślokas and elaborated the description of the Man-Lion *avatāra* declared in the Padmapurāṇa. The Kūrma (I. 1. 16-20), Padma (IV. 111. 95-98), the Devībhāgavata (I. 3. 13-16) set out the names of eighteen Upapurāṇas. Some of the Upapurāṇas bear the same names as those of the principal purāṇas, viz. Skanda, Vāmana, Brahmāṇḍa and Nāradīya. Prof. Hazra[1358] states that the number of Upapurāṇas is 100. Only a few of the Upapurāṇas have been published and those published do not differ much in the matter of subjects from some of the principal purāṇas and almost all belie the definition of Purāṇa as 'pañcalakṣaṇa'. It has been seen above (note 1349) that the number of ślokas in the 18 principal Purāṇas is said to be four lakhs. It must be remembered that this total *does not include* the number of the ślokas assigned to the Upapurāṇas, and no Purāṇa includes the verses of the Upapurāṇas in the total of four lakhs. Further, no one should forget or ignore the significance of the remarks of the

1358. Vide Prof. Hazra's paper on Upapurāṇas in ABORI. vol. XXI. pp. 38-62 at p. 49 note. His studies in 'Upapurāṇas, vol. I.' was read by me while this section was in the Press. I have, therefore, been compelled to add only a few matters from this work, mostly in the footnotes. In note 24 p. 13 of his 'Studies' he reiterates that he has collected the names of more than one hundred Upapurāṇas. On pp. 4-13 he sets out 23 sources (six being quotations from Kūrma in different nibandhas) of the lists of Upapurāṇas that exhibit great divergences and chaos. Wilson in his Preface to tr. of the Viṣṇu pp. LXXXVI-XCI mentions the varying lists of Upapurāṇas and offers remarks on some of them. The H. of. DH. vol. I. p. 163 gives the names of the 18 Upapurāṇas as contained in the Garuḍa I. 223. 17-20. Hemādri on Vrata (part 1. p. 21) sets out the names of the 18 Upapurāṇas from the Kūrma I. 1. 16-20 (with readings different from those of the printed Kūrma, some of which are rather serious).

Matsya and Kūrma about the Upapurāṇas. The Matsya[1359] speaks of the Upapurāṇas as sub-sections (upabhedas) of the principal eighteen Purāṇas and emphatically asserts 'know that whatever is declared as distinct from the eighteen Purāṇas came forth (or issued from) these (18)'. The Kūrma is no less clear. It states that[1360] the Upapurāṇas are the summaries or abridgments of the 18 (principal) Purāṇas made by sages after studying them. The lists of Upapurāṇas given by several works, most of which are set out by Prof. Hazra in his paper on Upapurāṇas (in ABORI vol. XXI at pp. 40-48) and in his Studies (pp. 4-13) diverge a good deal from each other. As the Matsya mentions by name only four Upapurāṇas it is not unreasonable to hold that more than four were not in existence at the time when this passage of the Matsya was inserted in it or at least that more than four had not been accepted as Upapurāṇas at that time. A good many of the Upapurāṇas are of late date. Only a few of the rest such as the Narasiṁha, the Viṣṇu-

---

1359. उपभेदान् प्रवक्ष्यामि लोके ये संप्रतिष्ठिताः। पाद्मे पुराणे यत्रोक्तं नरसिंहोपवर्णनम्। तच्चाष्टादशसाहस्रं नारसिंहमिहोच्यते। ...अष्टादशभ्यस्तु पृथक् पुराणं यत्प्रदिश्यते। विजानीध्वं द्विजश्रेष्ठास्तदेतेभ्यो विनिर्गतम्॥ मत्स्य 53. 58-59 and 63 q. by हेमाद्रि on व्रत part I pp. 21-22. These verses occur in स्कन्द (प्रभासखण्ड 2. 79-83) also; कृ. र. p. 32 explains 'विनिर्गतमुद्धृतम्। यथा कालिकापुराणादू'. Prof. Hazra in 'Studies &.' vol. I. p. 16 note 33 quotes परिभाषाप्रकाश p. 15 'एतान्युपपुराणानि पुराणेभ्य एव निर्गतानीति याज्ञवल्क्येन पुराणत्वेन सङ्गृहीतानि' and remarks that this implies that the Upapurāṇas were known to Yājñyavalkya. Prof. Hazra is wrong here. All that this passage means is that the Vīramitrodaya in the beginning of the 17th century A.D. (about 1500 years or more after Yāj.) thought that Yāj. included upapurāṇas in the word Purāṇa in Yāj. I. 3. That is Mitramiśra's view. We are not bound by it and should not draw any inference from it. Yāj. mentions only Purāṇa as a source of dharma but he is entirely silent as to how many Purāṇas had been composed in his time. There is nothing to show that they were more than three in his day and it is impossible for us to hold that he included upapurāṇas under the word Purāṇa, simply because some upapurāṇas were composed before 1000 A. D.

1360. अन्यान्युपपुराणानि मुनिभिः कथितानि तु। अष्टादशपुराणानि श्रुत्वा संक्षेपतो द्विजाः॥ कूर्म I. 1. 16. This verse and the following verses enumerating the 18 Upapurāṇas are quoted by हेमाद्रि on व्रत part I p. 21 (seven), by रघुनन्दन in the मलमासतत्त्व (Jiv. pp. 792-793) and by मित्रमिश्र in the परिभाषाप्रकाश (part of वीरमित्रोदय) pp. 13-14 and other late medieval works of the centuries from the 15th onwards, except हेमाद्रि who belongs to the latter half of the 13th century A. D. One cannot be sure that they are not interpolations in Hemādri. It should be noted that Raghunandana first expressly names only four Upapurāṇas, viz. Nārasiṁha, Nandi, Āditya and Kālikā and then quotes the names of the 18 Upapurāṇas from the Kūrma.

dharmottara, the Devī, can possibly be held to be as old as the 7th or 8th century A.D. I do not accept the view of Prof. Hazra, who places the period of the formation of the group of *eighteen* Upapurāṇas between 650-800 A. D. (in ABORI. vol. XXI. at p. 50 and also in 'Studies in Upapurāṇas ' vol. I. by Dr. Hazra), where while admitting (p. 14) that in the Upapurāṇa litarature there are works of comparatively late dates, he boldly states that the age of the Upapurāṇas began approximately from the Gupta period (p. 16). For this last statement there is absolutely no evidence whatever. A detailed discussion of the dates of all the Upapurāṇas would demand a large space and would be somewhat irrelevant in this section. We must hold fast by the facts that even when the 18 principal purāṇas assumed their present form, the number of Upapurāṇas was small, that they were looked upon as no more than abridgments or summaries of the principal Purāṇas, that the Purāṇas that mention upapurāṇas do not state that they were composed by the divinely inspired Vyāsa (but only by some sages as the Kūrma says) and that originally they had not the status or authority of the 18 purāṇas. The Saura, an Upapurāṇa itself, speaks of Upapurāṇas as *khilas* (9. 5). It is only the late medieval digests like the Smṛtitattva (1520–1570 A. D.) or the Vīramitrodaya (first half of 17th century) that were separated by several centuries from the Mahāpurāṇas as well as the Upapurāṇas and the writers of which had practically lost all sense of the distance in time between the two sets of Purāṇas, that say that the mention of Purāṇas[1361] as a source of dharma in Yāj. must be deemed to include Upapurāṇas also. This last may be the opinion of such late writers as Mitramiśra, but no scholar is bound to accept it. It is doubtful whether by the word Purāṇa, Yāj. refers to the Mahāpurāṇas now extant and whether he knows that there were eighteen of them. If some Upapurāṇas glorify themselves as of equal authority with the Mahāpurāṇas, that is of a piece with what the principal Purāṇas state about themselves viz. that Brahmā first thought of the Purāṇas and then the Vedas issued from his lips. Modern scholars should discount all these attempts at self-glorification. Upapurāṇas are due to sages. Upapurāṇas are distinguished from Purāṇas in several important respects. Firstly, the 18 purāṇas are attributed to the semi-divine Vyāsa; secondly, according to both Matsya and Kūrma, they were summaries of the Purāṇas; thirdly, the ślokas in the

1361. एतान्युपपुराणानि पुराणेभ्यो निर्गतानीति याज्ञवल्क्येन पुराणत्वेन सङ्गृहीतानि । परिभाषाप्रकाश (of वीरमित्रोदय) p. 14.

Upapurāṇas are not included in the 4 lakhs of verses of all the Purāṇas together; fourthly, early commentators and nibandha writers like the Mitākṣarā and the Kṛtyakalpataru either do not mention any of the Upapurāṇas or at the most only about half a dozen or so and that too rather sparingly; and lastly, as Prof. Hazra himself asserts ('Studies', vol. I. p. 23) adherents of various sects such as Śāktas, Sauras, Pāñcarātras interpolated chapters in the Purāṇas of the established group and in some cases wrote new and independent works to propagate their own ideas and styled them Purāṇas.

Early commentaries and digests of Dharmaśāstra very rarely refer to any of the well-known Upapurāṇas. The Mitākṣarā, though it names the Brāhma (on Yāj. I. 3 and 45), quotes passages from the Matsya (profusely), Viṣṇu (on Yāj. III. 6), Skanda (on Yāj. III. 290), Bhaviṣya (on Yāj. III. 6), Mārkaṇḍeya (on Yāj. I. 236, 254, III. 19, 287, 289) and Brahmāṇḍa (on Yāj. III. 30), hardly refers, so far as I know, to any Upapurāṇa. The Kṛtyakalpataru of Lakṣmīdhara (composed about 1110-1130 A. D.), twelve parts of which published in the G. O. S cover several thousand pages, profusely quotes many of the Mahāpurāṇas, and only six of the Upapurāṇas by name, viz. Ādi (only twice on śuddhi), Nandi (profusely only on dāna and niyatakālika), Āditya, Kālikā, Devī, Narasiṁha (all four profusely on several topics). Aparārka (first half of 12th century A. D.) who quotes profusely from Brahma, Brahmāṇḍa, Bhaviṣyat, Mārkaṇḍeya, Vāyu, Viṣṇu and Matsya quotes by name only the following Upapurāṇas and only sparingly viz. Ādi, Āditya, Kālikā, Devī, Nandi, Nṛsiṁha, Viṣṇudharmottara (seven times), Viṣṇurahasya (once), and Śivadharmottara (once). The Dānasāgara[1362] (written in 1169) states 'Upapurāṇas have been promulgated, which clearly set out the procedure of gifts' and it expressly mentions as Upapurāṇas dealing with gifts the Ādya (Ādi or Brahma?), Āditya, Kālikā, Nandi, Narasiṁha, Mārkaṇḍeya, Viṣṇudharmottara and Sāmba and remarks that the Viṣṇurahasya and Śivarahasya are merely compilations (saṅgraharūpa). It is not necessary to refer to writers later than about 1170 A. D. in the matter of Upapurāṇas.

The references to eighteen Purāṇas in about a dozen principal purāṇas and the description of their contents in some of

1362. उक्तान्युपपुराणानि व्यक्तदानविधीनि च। आद्यं पुराणं ब्राह्मं (साम्बं?) च कालिकाह्वयमेव च॥ नान्दमादित्यसंज्ञं च नारसिंहं तथैव च। मार्कण्डेयकृतं तद्वद्विष्णुधर्मोत्तराह्वयम्॥ शाम्बं च विष्णुधर्माख्यं गोपथब्राह्मणश्रुतिम्॥ दानसागर p. 3-verses 13-15.

them naturally lead to the inference that these passages were added some time after all the eighteen Purāṇas assumed a complete form. It is not possible to hold that all the main purāṇas were composed at the same time by one individual author or even by several contemporary writers. Besides, most of the editions of Purāṇas are based either on a single ms. or on a few mss. collected at random and are not critically edited as is the case with the critical edition of the Mahābhārata published in Poona by the B. O. R. I. Many conclusions therefore, drawn from the current printed editions of the Purāṇas or from mss. of the Purāṇas, must be regarded as merely tentative and as likely to turn out to be wrong. What Winternitz said in his History of Indian Literature (English translation, Calcutta, vol. I. p. 469) viz. 'that the date of each section, nay, sometimes of each single verse in the Mahābhārata must be determined separately' applies with equal (or perhaps greater) force to the Purāṇas, perticularly when one wants to use the section or stanza for historical or comparative purposes.[1363]

It may be conceded that the Purāṇas and some of the available Upapurāṇas also contain many ancient legends and traditions; but these have been so much tampered with and inflated by additions intended to bolster up particular forms of worship and particular tenets that great caution is required before one can recognize them as genuine and reliable representatives for ascertaining the *general state* of Indian society and *beliefs* in ancient and medieval times.

In the opinion of the present writer there is no positive objective evidence for placing any of the upapurāṇas except the Viṣṇudharmottara before the 8th or 9th century A. D. Even in the case of Purāṇas, there have been large interpolations such as verses about the 18 purāṇas, their number and contents. But they contain much ancient material and are far more reliable than most of the Upapurāṇas, having been quoted by writers from 8th and 9th centuries A. D. or even earlier.

The Amarakośa[1364] defines 'Itihāsa' as 'what happened in the past' and 'Purāṇa' as 'what has five signs or characteristics'. It is no doubt true that some purāṇas speak of Purāṇa as

---

1363. Vide Dr. V. S. Sukthankar in Kane Festschrift pp. 472–487 (about the Rāma episode in the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa) at p. 474.

1364. इतिहासः पुरावृत्तं ... पुराणं पञ्चलक्षणम्। अमरकोश, शब्दादिवर्ग 4–5.

'pañcalakṣaṇa' and set out the five characteristics[1365] as *sarga* (creation), *pratisarga* (re-creation after dissolution of the world), *vaṁśa* (dynasties of gods, the Sun and the Moon, and the patriarchs), *manvantara* (the vast periods of time that are so called), *vaṁśānucarita* or *vaṁśyānucarita* (deeds and history of the descendants of the solar, lunar and other dynasties). The Bhāgavata[1366] states that ten topics are dealt with by Purāṇas and that some say that they are only five. The ten topics of the Bhāgavata are *sarga*, *visarga* (dissolution or creation after destruction), vṛtti (modes of subsistence, natural or prescribed for all men by śāstra), *rakṣā* (protection i. e. *avatāras* destroying those that hate the Vedas), *antarāṇi* (i. e. manvataras), vaṁśa, vaṁśyānucarita, *saṁsthā* (four kinds of *laya*), *hetu* (the cause of creation viz. the soul that is subject to avidyā and collects *karma*), *apāśraya* (the refuge of individual souls, viz. *brahman*). The Matsyapurāṇa also mentions other characteristics of Purāṇas viz. in all Purāṇas the four goals of man (puruṣārthas) are described, also the consequences of doing what is opposed to dharma, division of Purāṇas into *sāttvika*, *rājasa*, *tāmasa*, the sāttvika and rājasa purāṇas respectively extolling the greatness of Hari and Brahmā, tāmasa Purāṇas extolling Agni and Śiva, the mixed ones extolling the greatness of Sarasvatī and *pitṛs*. The questions addressed by Manu to Keśava (in Matsya 2. 22–24) indicate the subjects that would be dealt with by that Purāṇa viz. creation and dissolution, the *vaṁśas*,

---

1365. सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वंशो मन्वन्तराणि च। वंश्यानुचरितं (v. l. वंशानु॰) चैव पुराणं पञ्चलक्षणम्॥ वायु 4. 10–11, वराह 2. 4, कूर्म I. 1. 12, भविष्य I. 2. 4, मार्कण्डेय 134. 13–14; मत्स्य has पञ्चाङ्गानि पुराणेषु आख्यानकमिति स्मृतम्। सर्गश्च...लक्षणम्॥ 53. 65; विष्णु reads सर्गश्च... वंशमन्वन्तराणि च। सर्वेष्वेतेषु कथ्यन्ते वंशानुचरितं च यत्॥ III. 6 24; अग्नि reads सर्गस्य प्रतिसर्गस्य वंशमन्वन्तरस्य च। वंशानुचरितादेश्च मत्स्यकूर्मादिरूपधृक्॥; वराह observes 'पुराणानां हि सर्वेषामयं साधारणः स्मृतः। श्लोकं यदपि निश्चित्य निःशेषं त्वमतः शृणु॥ सर्गश्च...लक्षणम्॥ 2. 3–4. सर्ग is dealt with in ब्रह्म chap. 1–3, ब्रह्माण्ड II. 8–13, वायु 4–6, कूर्म I. 2, 4, 7, 8, अग्नि 17 and 20 &c. For प्रतिसर्ग vide ब्रह्म 2. 32–37, ब्रह्माण्ड II. 7, विष्णु I. 2ff, कूर्म II. 45, वायु 7; वंशs are dealt with in several पुराणs as in वायु 99, विष्णु IV, ब्रह्म 8, ब्रह्माण्ड II.14, कूर्म I.20–25, भागवत IX and XII, अग्नि 18, 273–75, 277–78; for मन्वन्तरs vide विष्णु III. 1–2, ब्रह्म 4–6, वायु 100, ब्रह्माण्ड II. chap. 6. 35-38, कूर्म I. 51, भागवत III and VIII.

1366. पुराणलक्षणं ब्रह्मन् ब्रह्मर्षिभिर्निरूपितम्। शृणुष्व बुद्धिमाश्रित्य वेदशास्त्रानुसारतः॥ सर्गोऽस्याथ विसर्गश्च वृत्तिरक्षान्तराणि च। वंशो वंश्यानुचरितं संस्था हेतुरपाश्रयः। दशभिर्लक्षणैर्युक्तं पुराणं तद्विदो विदुः। केचित्पञ्चविधं ब्रह्मन् महदल्पव्यवस्थया॥ भागवत XII. 7. 8–10; verses 11–19 explain the ten lakṣaṇas. हेतुर्जीवोऽस्य सर्गादेरविद्याकर्मकारकः। ये चानुशायिनं प्राहुरव्याकृतमुतापरे। व्यतिरेकान्वयो यस्य जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तिषु। मायामयेषु तद्ब्रह्म जीववृत्तिष्वपाश्रयः॥ भागवत XII. 7. 18–19.

manvantaras, *vaṁśyācarita*, the expanse of the world, rules about dānas, śrāddha, varṇas and āśramas, *iṣṭa* and *pūrta*, establishment of images of gods, and everything else.

It is not quite clear why the Amarakośa seized upon the above mentioned five topics as characteristics of Purāṇas. Amarakośa[1367] cannot be placed later than the 5th century A. D. It is likely that before that time the number of Purāṇas was not large, that they had not become very inflated, and that, as Itihāsa and Purāṇa were often lumped together as the 5th Veda in the Upaniṣads, they both had certain matters in common. Itihāsa did not probably deal with creation, dissolution and manvantaras, but contented itself with the dynasties of kings and with the deeds and legends about the heroes of the past. Rarely, Itihāsa (Mahābhārata) is called Purāṇa and some extant Purāṇas describe themselves as Itihāsa. For example, the Vāyu[1368] calls itself in the same context both itihāsa and purāṇa. The Brahmapurāṇa calls itself Purāṇa as well as ākhyāna (245. 27 and 30). The Mahābhārata[1369], though generally called itihāsa by itself (as in Ādi. 1. 19, 26, 54) or the best of itihāsas, still applies to itself the words. 'ākhyāna[1370] (as in Ādi 2. 388–89), Kāvya (Ādi 2. 390), Kārṣṇaveda (Ādi 1. 264) and Purāṇa (Ādi 1. 17). From this it appears that originally the line of demarcation between the two was rather thin. In defining Purāṇa as 'pañcalakṣaṇa' the Amarakośa and some of the Purāṇas seized upon such topics as distinguished Purāṇas from Itihāsa and other branches of Sanskrit literature. It has been

1367. In 'India, what can it teach us' (1882) p. 328 Max Muller points out that the Amarakośa was translated into Chinese about 561–566 A.D. Mr. Oak, editor of the Amarakośa with the commentary of Kṣīrasvāmin, assigns it to the 4th century A. D. and Hoernle (in J.R.A.S. for 1906 pp. 940–941) on rather slender and far-fetched evidence puts it between 625 A. D. and 950 A. D.

1368. इमं यो ब्राह्मणो विद्वानितिहासं पुरातनम्। शृणुयाच्छ्रावयेद्वापि तथाध्यापयतेऽपि च॥ ...धन्यं यशस्यमायुष्यं पुण्यं वेदैश्च संमतम्। कृष्णद्वैपायनेनोक्तं पुराणं ब्रह्मवादिना। वायु 103. 48, 51; vide also वायु 103. 56 (इतिहास) and 58 (पुराण), ब्रह्माण्ड IV. 4. 47, 50 (which are the same as वायु 103. 48 and 51).

1369. जयो नामेतिहासोऽयं श्रोतव्यो विजिगीषुणा। उद्योग 136.18; जयो नामेतिहासोयं श्रोतव्यो मोक्षमिच्छता। स्वर्गारोहणिक 5. 51; इतिहासोत्तमादस्माज्जायन्ते कविबुद्धयः॥ आदि 2. 385.

1370. अनाश्रित्यैतदाख्यानं कथा भुवि न विद्यते। आदि 2. 37 and 388; इदं कविवरैः सर्वैराख्यानमुपजीव्यते॥ आदि 2. 389.

shown above that the Purāṇa and Bhaviṣyatpurāṇa that existed before Āpastamba contained not only sarga and pratisarga but also some smṛti materials as well. From the definition given in the Purāṇas and the Amarakośa it does not at all follow that those five topics alone were the constituent parts of the very ancient *Purāṇas*, as Kirfel holds;[1371] What could be said at the most is that five were the distinctive topics that differentiated the Purāṇa class of works from other branches of literature and probably cognate works called Itihāsa or it may be that the five are generalized as an ideal for Purāṇas and that the very early representatives of this class (that existed before Āp. Dh. S.) had not these five as characteristics.

The extant Purāṇas contain far more subjects than the five. Some Purāṇas barely touch these five and deal at great length with altogether different topics. Only a few of the extant Purāṇas can be said to deal with all the five topics at some length. The five characteristic topics occupy less than three percent of the extent of the extant Mahāpurāṇas. Of all Purāṇas the extant Viṣṇu alone closely agrees with the definition of Purāṇa as 'pañcalakṣaṇa,' though it also contains a good many other topics. On a modest calculation the four subjects of vrata, śrāddha, tīrtha and dāna cover at least one hundred thousand ślokas in the extant eighteen main Purāṇas. Several of them have identical chapters on several topics (e. g. Matsya[1372] and Padma, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa contain long passages that agree *verbatim* with one another in many matters and details). It is probable, therefore, that the extant principal Purāṇas are partial and gradually inflated representatives of an earlier group of Purāṇas (not necessarily 18 in number) that

---

1371. Vide Kirfel's Einleitung p. XX of 'Purāṇa pañcalakṣaṇa'; J. of Veṅkateśvara O. I. vol. VII and at p. 94 for Kirfel's view.

1372. For example, Matsya chapters 55 and 57–60 are the same as Padma V. 24. 64–278, Matsya 62–64 = Padma V. 22. 61–164, Matsya 69–70 = Padma V. 23. 2–146, Matsya 71–72 = Padma V. 24. 1–64, Matsya 74–80 = Padma V. 21. 215–321, Matsya 83–92 = Padma V. 21. 81–213 &c.; Kirfel in 'Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa' (and vol. VII. pp. 84–86 of JVOI) gives a chapter concordance of Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu and remarks that Brahmāṇḍa I. 27 (of 129 verses) and II. 21–58 (of 2141 ślokas) have nothing corresponding in Vāyu, while Vāyu has 2704 ślokas that do not correspond to anything in Brahmāṇḍa (vide 'Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa' p. XIII and J. V O. I. vol. VII, 1946, p. 87). Kirfel also furnishes a table of chapters that are common to both Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu (pp. XV–XVI) and vol, VII. pp. 88–90 of JVOI).

existed before Yājñavalkya. In the present state of our knowledge it is almost an insoluble problem to find out what these Purāṇas were or contained. The number 18 was probably due to the fact that the number is prominent in several connections as regards the Mahābhārata. The Bhārata war was fought for 18 days, the total of the vast armies engaged in the conflict came to 18 akṣauhiṇīs, the epic has 18 *parvans*, the Gītā also has 18 chapters.[1373]

The Purāṇas may be classified into several categories, viz. (1) encyclopaedic like the Agni, Garuḍa and Nāradīya, (2) those mainly dealing with tīrthas such as Padma, Skanda and Bhaviṣya, (3) sectarian, such as Liṅga, Vāmana, Mārkaṇḍeya, (4) Historical such as Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa. The Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Matsya and Viṣṇu are probably the oldest among extant Purāṇas, though they too have received substantial additions from time to time.

There are seven Purāṇas that contain historical material, viz. the ancient dynasties down to the time of the Bhārata war and from the Bhārata war to the downfall of the Andhras and the rise of the Guptas,[1374] viz. Vāyu 99. 250–435, Viṣṇu IV. 20. 12 to IV. 24. 44, Brahmāṇḍa III. 74. 104–248, Bhāgavata IX. 12. 9–16, IX. 22. 34–49 and XII. 17, Garuḍa 140 and 141. 1–12, Bhaviṣya III. 3 and 4 (this account is practically worthless). Matsya contains the fullest list of Āndhra kings and states (273. 16–17) that 29 Āndhra kings will rule for 460 years, while the Vāyu (99. 357–358) states that 30 Andhra kings will rule[1374a] for 456 (406?) years. Both Vāyu (99. 355) and Matsya (373. 16) ('Pulovā' in Vāyu) make Puloma as the last king of the Āndhras. Ptolemy who published his 'Geography of India' about

1373. Vide Otto Stein's paper on the number 18 in 'Poona Orientalist' Vol. I. pp. 1–37.

1374. अनुगङ्गं प्रयागं च साकेतु (तं?) मगधांस्तथा। एताञ्जनपदान्सर्वान् भोक्ष्यन्ते गुप्तवंशजाः॥ वायु 99. 383, ब्रह्माण्ड III.74 195 (reads अनुगङ्गाप्रयागं च and सप्तवंशजाः); भागवत (XII. 1. 37) reads अनुगङ्गामाप्रयागं गुप्तां भोक्ष्यति मेदिनीम्।; विष्णु IV. 24.63 reads उत्साद्याखिलक्षत्रजातिं नव नागाः पद्मावत्यां नाम पुर्यामनुगङ्गाप्रयागं गयाद्गुप्तांश्च मागधा भोक्ष्यन्ति।. Vide Pargiter's 'Purāṇa text &c.' p 53 where the passage is set out and variant readings are noted. Vide I. H. Q. vol. XXI pp. 141–143 on 'Purāṇas on the Imperial Guptas' by D. C. Ganguly who criticizes Pargiter's view (pp. XII–XIII in Intro. to Purāṇa texts) and does not agree that the Purāṇa accounts refer to 320–335 A. D.

1374a. 'History of Deccan' by Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar for list of सातवाहन kings (in Bombay Gazetter vol. I, part 2, p. 168).

150 A.D. states that Ptolemaios was king of Baithana (Paiṭhaṇa) in his days (vide J.I.H. vol. 22, 1943, at p. 84 in an article on 'Apostles of Kalyan'. So that these historical references to Āndhras must be a good deal later than 150 A.D. Only four Purāṇas viz. Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu mention in a general way that kings of the Gupta dynasty will rule along the Ganges up to Prayāga, Sāketa (Ayodhyā) and Magadha, but no names of Gupta kings are specified. The passages referring to the Guptas are rather corrupt.[1374b] It is argued by Pargiter (in 'Dynasties of the Kali age' p. XII.) and others that Samudragupta was a great conqueror as his Allahabad Praśasti shows (Fleet's 'Gupta Inscriptions' No. 1). Most scholars are agreed that the Gupta dynasty began to rule about 320 A.D. It is argued that, if the reviser or revisers of the Purāṇas had known the brilliant campaigns of Samudragupta they would have named him at least and that therefore the revision of the Vāyu took place between 320-335 A.D.

There is a large mass of Literature dealing with several questions relating to Purāṇas. For those who desire to make a close study of them and wish to be acquainted with the controversies relating to Purāṇas, some of the more important works and papers on the Purāṇas may be mentioned here: H. H. Wilson's Introduction to the English tr. of the Viṣṇupurāṇa, vol. 1. (1864); F. E. Pargiter's 'Purāṇa texts of the dynasties of the Kali age' (1913), 'Ancient Indian genealogies' in Sir R. G. Bhandarkar Presentation volume pp. 107-113, 'Ancient Indian Historical Tradition' (Oxford, 1922); W. Kirfel's 'das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa' (Bonn, 1927), 'die Cosmographie der Inder' (1920), 'Bharatavarṣa' (Stuttgart, 1931); Vries on 'Purāṇa studies' in Pavry commemoration vol. pp. 482-487 (applies Kirfel's method to the subject of śrāddha in the Brahmāṇḍa, Harivaṁśa, Matsya, Padma and Vāyu); Haraprasad Shastri's descriptive cat. of Mss. at the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. V. Preface pp. LXXIII-CCXXV and his paper on "Mahāpurāṇas" in J. B. O. R. S. vol. XV. p. 323-340; Prof. B. C. Majumdar's paper in Sir Asutosh Mookerji Silver Jubilee vol. III, Orientalia, part 2 pp. 9-30; Dr. A. Banerji Sāstri's paper on

---

1374 b. इत्येते वै नृपास्त्रिंशदन्ध्रा भोक्ष्यन्ति वै महीम्। समाः शतानि चत्वारि पञ्च षड् वै तथैव च। (पञ्चाशद्वै ?)। वायु 99. 357-358. The words mean on the decimal positional notation 400 + 5 (i. e. 50, tens place) and 6 (i. e 456). मत्स्य 273. 16-17 reads एकोनविंशतिर्ह्येते आन्ध्रा भोक्ष्यन्ति वै महीम्। समाः शतानि चत्वारि पञ्चाशत् षडिरेव च ॥. It may be noticed that मत्स्य speaks of आन्ध्रs while वायु calls them अन्ध्रs.

'Ancient Indian Historical Tradition' in J. B. O. R. S. vol. XIII. pp. 62-79 (supplies a useful corrective to many sweeping assertions of such scholars as Macdonell, Pargiter and others); Cambridge History of India, vol. I. pp. 296-318; Winternitz's 'History of Indian Literature,' English Tr. vol. I. pp. 296-318; Prof. H. C. Hazra's 'Studies in the Purāṇic Records of Hindu rites and customs' (Dacca 1940), papers on 'Purāṇas in the History of smṛti' in 'Indian Culture,' vol. I. pp. 587-614, 'Mahāpurāṇas' in Dacca University Studies' vol. II. pp. 62-69; 'Smṛti chapters in Purāṇas (I. H. Q. vol. XI pp. 108-130), 'Pre-Purāṇic Hindu Society before 200 A.D.' (I. H. Q. vol. XV. pp. 403-431), 'Purāṇic rites and customs influenced by the economic and social views of the sacerdotal class' (in Dacca University Studies' vol. XII. pp. 91-101), 'Influence of Tantra on Smṛtinibandhas' (in A. B. O. R. I. vol. XV. pp. 220-235 and vol XVI pp. 202-211), 'the Upapurāṇas' (in A. B. O. R. I. vol. XXI. pp. 38-62); 'Purāṇa Literature as known to Ballālasena' (in the J. O. R., Madras, vol. XII. pp. 129-146), 'Some Minor Purāṇas' in A. B. O. R. I. vol. XIX. pp. 69-79, 'the Aśvamedha, the common source of origin of the Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa and the Mahābhārata' A. B. O. R. I. vol. 36 (1955 pp. 190-203); 'Some lost Upapurāṇas' in J. A. S., Calcutta, vol. 20 pp. 15-38; and many other papers on individual Purāṇas specified at the end of this part; Das-Gupta's Indian Philosophy, vol. III. pp. 496-511 on 'Philosophical speculations of some Purāṇas'; Dr. D. R. Patil's paper on 'Gupta Inscriptions and Purāṇic tradition' (in Bulletin of D. C. R. I., vol. II. pp 2-58, comparing passages from Gupta Inscriptions and Purāṇas); Prof. V. R. Ramchandra Dikṣitar's 'The Purāṇas, a study' (in I. H. Q. vol. VIII. pp. 747-67) and 'Purāṇa Index' in three volumes; Dr. A. D. Pusalkar's paper in 'Progress of Indic Studies' (1917-1942) in Silver Jubilee Volume of BORI. pp. 139-152 and 'Studies in Epics and Purāṇas of India' (B. V. Bombay, 1953); Prof. D. R. Mankad's[1375] papers on 'Yugas' (in P. O.

1375. Prof. Mankad's theories are sometimes extraordinary and advanced without any proper or objective evidence. For example, in his paper in the B. V, vol. VI. he boldly asserts that Śuṅga is a Chinese family name, that Puṣyamitra's ancestors were originally Chinese, that Bhāradvāja is a family of Sāmavedins and that he *believes* that the origin of Sāmaveda is Chinese, as its peculiar total music suggests. When it is a mere matter of *belief* without any evidence being adduced, no arguments can convince such a believer that he is wrong. One of his astounding theories is that each of the kings mentioned in the Purāṇik texts is not a real king, but represents a time unit of forty years.

vol. VI. part 3–4 pp. 6–10), on 'Manvantaras' (IHQ. vol. XVIII. pp. 208–230) and in B. V. vol. VI. pp. 6–10; Dr. Ghurye's Presidential Address in the section on Ethnology and Folklore in Pro. of 9th A. I. O. C. (1937) pp. 911–954; Dr. A. S. Altekar's paper 'Can we re-construct pre-Bhārata-war history?' in J.B.H.U. vol. IV. pp. 183–223 (holding that the various pre-Bhārata-war dynasties mentioned in the Purāṇas are as historical and real as the dynasties of Mauryas and Āndhras and the Paurāṇic genealogies really refer to kings who figure in the Vedic Literature also); Dr. Jadunath Sinha's 'A History of Indian Philosophy' vol. 1 pp. 125–177 on the philosophy of the Purāṇas' (1956); two papers 'on the ancient chronology of India' by R. Martin Smith in J. A. O. S. vol. 77 No. 2 (April–June 1957) and No. 4 Dec. 1957 (He follows Pargiter in his texts).

Some remarks on the important conclusions of Pargiter and Kirfel are necessary. Pargiter tries to construct history from the earliest times to the Bhārata war which he holds to have taken place about 950 B. C. (AIHT, chap. 15 p. 182). He holds that there were two traditions in ancient India, viz. the Kṣatriya tradition and the Brāhmaṇa tradition (AIHT, chap. 5 pp. 58–77). He harps dozens of times on the utter lack of the historic sense among the brāhmaṇas in his work (AIHT), holds that the Purāṇas represent the kṣatriya tradition, that there were three racial stocks, viz. the Mānavas (or Mānvas as he styles them), the Ailas and the Saudyumnas, that respectively represent the Dravidian, the Aryan and Munda (AIHT chap. 25 pp. 289–302), that the Purāṇas are Sanskritizations of works in Prakrit (pp. X–XI) of 'Dynasties of the Kali age'. His date for the Mahābhārata war has not been accepted by later scholars, since his handling of that subject is not judicial, objective or straightforward, but relies too much on his own prejudices and on averages. In his 'Purāṇa texts of the dynasties of the Kali age (pp. 58, 74) he appears to favour the view that the Bhārata war was fought 1050 years before the Nandas i. e. about 1475 B. C. The mss. and the printed Purāṇas give four different periods between the birth of Parikṣit[1376] and

---

1376. यावत्परीक्षितो जन्म यावन्नन्दाभिषेचनम्। एतद्वर्षसहस्रं तु ज्ञेयं पञ्चदशोत्तरम्॥ विष्णु IV. 24. 32; भागवत XII. 2. 26 reads (आरभ्य भवतो जन्म...सहस्रं तु शतं पञ्चदशोत्तरम्); महापद्माभिषेकात्तु यावज्जन्म परीक्षितः। एतद्वर्षसहस्रं तु ज्ञेयं पञ्चाशदुत्तरम्॥ मत्स्य 273. 35 (reads एवं वर्ष°), वायु 99. 415 (reads महादेवाभिषेकात्तु), ब्रह्माण्ड III. 74. 227 (reads महानन्दाभिषेकान्तं). श्रीधर commenting on Bhāgavata XII.2.26

(Continued on next page)

the crowning of Nanda, viz. 1015 years (Viṣṇu), 1050 years (Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and mss. of Matsya), 1115 years (Bhāgavata), 1500 years (some mss. of Viṣṇu and of Matsya). Pargiter himself argues forcefully for the trustworthiness of tradition and Paurāṇika genealogies in R.G. Bhandarkar Presentation volume pp. 107–113 and in AIHT chap. X. p. 119–125. Besides, there is the common experience that the total number of years between one well-known event and another can be easily remembered and handed down even orally for hundreds of years, while handing down hundreds of royal names is a difficult matter and some names may easily drop out. Moreover, the Matsya, Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu themselves say that they [1377] mention only the *prominent* kings of the Ikṣvāku line and the Bṛhadratha line [1378] and even as to the Paurava [1379] line it is clear that that dynasty had many names not all of which are enumerated. There is therefore every possibility that some kings dropped out even in later genealogies also (as for example Matsya 213. 16, saying that Āndhras were 29 and Vāyu 99. 357 saying they were 30). Merely counting the total of the kings actually named in the Purāṇas would not convey a quite accurate idea of the total length of years during which that dynasty ruled. Bearing in mind the two matters (viz. trustworthiness of tradition and Paurāṇika genealogies and the ease of remembering the time distance between too well-known events) he should have endeavoured to find out the age of the Bhārata War. He brushes aside the statement of the period between Parīkṣit and Nanda as unreli-

(*Continued from last page*)

states that in the 9th Skandha the Bhāgavata assigns 1000 years to 20 kings from Mārjāri of the Māgadha line (a contemporary of Parīkṣit), then 5 Pradyotana kings ruled for 138 years, then the Śiśunāgas ruled for 360 years; thus 1498 years passed between Parīkṣit and the crowning of Nanda and therefore he supports the reading of the interval as 1500 years.

1377. एते वैवस्वते वंशे राजानो भूरिदक्षिणाः। इक्ष्वाकुवंशप्रभवाः प्राधान्येन प्रकीर्तिताः॥ मत्स्य 12. 57; एते हीक्ष्वाकुदायादा राजानः शतशः स्मृताः। वंशे प्रधाना एतस्मिन् प्राधान्येन तु कीर्तिताः। ब्रह्माण्ड III. 64. 213–214; एते इक्ष्वाकुदायादा राजानः प्रायशः स्मृताः। वंशे... कीर्तिताः॥ वायु 88. 213 (as in ब्रह्माण्ड).

1378. अत ऊर्ध्वं प्रवक्ष्यामि मागधेयान् बृहद्रथान्। जरासन्धस्य ये वंशे सहदेवान्वये नृपाः॥ अतीता वर्तमानाश्च भविष्याश्च तथा पुनः। प्राधान्यतः प्रवक्ष्यामि गदतो मे निबोधत॥ वायु 99. 294–295, ब्रह्माण्ड III. 74. 107–109, मत्स्य 271. 17–18.

1379. आसीत्सुधर्मतनयः सार्वभौमः प्रतापवान्। सार्वभौमेति विख्यातः पृथिव्यामेकराड्‍विभौ॥ तस्यान्ववाये महति महापौरवनन्दनः। महापौरव पुत्रस्तु राजा रुक्मरथः स्मृतः॥ मत्स्य 49. 71–73, वायु 99. 186–187 (with very insignificant variations).

able simply on the ground (which appears to me flimsy) that the figures (1015, 1050) are discrepant (A. I. H. T. p. 180). In almost all passages of the Purāṇas there is some discrepancy or other. Therefore, he should have made an endeavour to find out which one of the three periods (1015, 1050, 1500) is supported by the best and oldest mss. and should have stuck to them, particularly when the Sanskrit equivalents of the three periods (*pañcadaśa*, *pañcāśat* and *pañcaśata*) are so much alike that scribes might easily have been confused and made their own readings. Even taking the least period of (1015) years, the Mahābhārata War would have to be placed at about 1440 B. C. (adding 1015 to the date of Nanda's enthronement, viz. about 425 B. C.). Most Western writers and Prof. S. N. Pradhan (in 'Chronology of ancient India', Calcutta 1927, pp. 249ff) find fault with Paurāṇika statements and brush them aside as practically worthless. Prof. Pradhan takes the kings actually named in the three lines, holds that 28 years are the average reign period of each and multiplying the number of kings by 28 arrives at the conclusion that the Mahābhārata war was fought about 1150 B.C. It is not possible to deal at length with his arguments. But he ignores the express words of the Purāṇas that they enumerate only the *principal* or *important* kings. Besides, there are scholars like Pargiter who regard 17 or 18 years as the average reign of a king in other countries (and in India also). The author cannot accept Prof. Pradhan's reasoning. Most Western writers are loth to assign old dates to matters Indian. Pargiter is no exception. Instead of straightforwardly accepting one of the three periods that was strongly supported by mss. he indulges in some devices that appear like tricks of jugglery (A. I. H. T. pp. 180–183). His method requires some explanation and examination.

Vyāsa is said to have been alive when the Bhārata battle was fought at the end of the Dvāpara age and he is also held to be the author of the 18 Purāṇas. The kings before the Bhārata war, the Pāṇḍava heroes and a few descendants of them and of some contemporaries of them are treated by the Matsya, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and others as past (*atīta*). Adhisomakṛṣṇa or Adhisīmakṛṣṇa, who[1380] was 6th in direct descent from Arjuna

1380. The genealogy of अधिसीमकृष्ण is as follows: अर्जुन–son अभिमन्यु–son परीक्षित्-son जनमेजय-son शतानीक. then अश्वमेधदत्त. then अधिसीमकृष्ण. Vide वायु 99, 249–258, the last verse being, अधिसीमकृष्णो धर्मात्मा सांप्रतोयं महायशाः। यस्मिन् प्रशासति महीं युष्माभिरिदमाहृतम् ॥; मत्स्य 50. 55–67 has almost the same words as Vāyu, but states that अधिसीमकृष्ण was son of शतानीक.

(excluding Arjuna) is said to have been alive when the Purāṇas were narrated to the sages at the *sattra*. Both Vāyu (99. 282) and Matsya (271. 5) state that in the Ikṣvāku line king Divākara, 6th (or 5th in Matsya) in descent from Bṛhadbala, was alive at the time when the Purāṇas were narrated. Then the same Purāṇas (Vāyu 99. 30, Matsya 271. 23 and Brahmāṇḍa III. 74. 113) state that in the line of Jarāsandha (ruler of Magadha), who was a contemporary of the Pāṇḍavas and whose son Sahadeva was killed in the Bhārata war, there was Senājit who was a contemporary of Adhisīma-kṛṣṇa and Divākara and who was 7th in descent from Sahadeva. These three are described as *vartamāna* kings in the Purāṇas and all those that came after these three are described as *bhaviṣya*. Pargiter first (AIHT p. 180) takes the total of the kings of the three dynasties, Aikṣvāka, Paurava and Māgadha that are actually named (ignoring what the Purāṇas say viz. that only the principal or important kings are named and *not all*) and the total of the reigns of all these (1408 years), finds that the average of the reign of each king in the three lines works out at such large figures as 47, 50, 31, which he regards as impossible when tested by real historical averages. But he forgets that the Purāṇas say that in the Aikṣvāka, Magadha and Paurava lines and also generally only the prominent kings are mentioned and also that the extant Purāṇas are only fragments left of the originals, since in the Brahmāṇḍa (III. 74) all Paurava and Aikṣvāka kings are altogether lost. Then he takes the total number of kings in ten kingdoms up to Mahāpadma and arrives at the average of 26 kings for each kingdom (AIHT p. 181). Then he says that the average of fourteen series of kings in Eastern and Western countries which he examined comes to 19 years for each reign and, holding that the average in eastern countries is less than in western countries, he arrives at the average of 18 years for each reign (pp. 181–182), which he regards as fair and rather liberal. He then multiplies the average 18 (of length of reigns) by 26 (the average number of kings in ten countries which he supposes to be the only kings in those ten) and arrives at the figure 468 years. He adds these to the date which he assigns to Mahāpadma Nanda 382 B. C. and thus arrives at 850 B. C. as the mean date of the beginning of the reign of Adhisīmakṛṣṇa, Divākara and Senājit, who were *vartamāna* kings. Then he takes five as the average of the kings between the *vartamāna* kings and Yudhiṣṭhira and assigning about 100 years to these 5 kings, arrives at the date 950 B. C. for the Bhārata war. He

discards (AIHT p. 180 n 3) the astronomical evidence contained in the Purāṇas (and the Mahābhārata) about Bhārata war in a single sentence viz. that astronomical statements can have no scientific precision and can only have been formed by estimate at the close. The probable date of the Mahābhārata war has been discussed by the author at some length on materials supplied by the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas, Varāhamihira, Āryabhaṭa and Inscriptions in vol. III. pp. 895–923 and therefore he does not go into that question here. But he strongly disapproves of the methods of Pargiter and the date he deduces. Later scholars like Kirfel have not accepted the conclusions of Pargiter about two separate traditions and about the Purāṇas being Sanskritizations of originals written in Prakrit and Kharoṣṭhī script (p. XVI. of Intro. to 'Purāṇa Texts &c.'). The importance of another independent source has not been taken proper notice of by Pargiter and even by Kirfel. It appears that about 300 B. C. Megasthenes was supplied with a list of kings from Bacchus to Alexander's time (153 or 154 in number) covering by their reigns a period of 6451 years and three months. Vide 'Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian' by McCrindle (1877) p. 115 and Cambridge History of Ancient India, vol. I. (1922, p. 409). Even supposing for argument that the account of kings is not trustworthy the fact remains that about 300 B. C. Indians claimed that they had lists of kings that reigned before that date for thousands of years (and not for a few hundred years as Pargiter would have us believe).

It has been shown above that Āpastamba mentions a Bhaviṣyatpurāṇa and quotes four verses from a Purāṇa (p. 817, note 1328). That Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa was probably so called because it contained in a prophetic vein the names and other details of kings that flourished after the Bhārata heroes and after a few generations of descendants of them and their contemporaries and probably purported to have been composed by some sage or by Vyāsa. As the Kali age is said to have started after the Bhārata war, as Parāśara, his son Vyāsa and Vyāsa's son Śuka were regarded as more or less contemporaries of the Pāṇḍavas that lived in the Dvāpara age and as all the 18 Purāṇas are deemed to have been composed by Vyāsa[1381] in the Dvāpara age, the history of the kings of the Kali age from the descendants

---

1381. अष्टादश पुराणानि कृत्वा सत्यवतीसुतः। भारताख्यानमखिलं चक्रे तदुपबृंहितम्॥ मत्स्य 53. 70.

of Adhisīmakṛṣṇa and his contemporaries downwards has been furnished by the Purāṇas in the form of a prophetic style. It has not been clearly noticed by both Pargiter and Kirfel that the so-called future kings are divided into two groups, viz. the kings of the Aila, Aikṣvāka and Māgadha lines from Adhisīmakṛṣṇa, Divākara and Senājit to the last scions of these lines (such[1382] as Sumitra in the Aikṣvāka line, Kṣemaka in the Aila line) form one group and later kings in the lines of Pradyotas, Śuṅgas, Āndhras, Śakas and others form another group and further that the first group was most probably dealt with in the ancient Bhaviṣya-purāṇa or some other Purāṇa if we rely on Āpastamba, but the other group not having been in existence when the Bhaviṣyat was composed (before 500–400 B. C.) was dealt with by the extant Purāṇas from information received by them apart from the ancient Bhaviṣyat. This is clear from the passages of the Matsya and Vāyu quoted[1383] below. The Matsya says 'After this I shall proclaim those *future* kings in the Aiḍa (Aila), Aikṣvāka and Paurava lines and those with whom those three benign (or virtuous) families will come to an end and I shall enumerate all of these kings that are narrated in the Bhaviṣya. *Other kings different* from the preceding that will arise, such as Kṣatras (? of the

---

1382. अत्रानुवंशश्लोकोयं भविष्यज्ञैरुदाहृतः। इक्ष्वाकूणामयं वंशः सुमित्रान्तो भविष्यति। सुमित्रं प्राप्य राजानं संस्थां प्राप्स्यति वै कलौ॥ वायु 99.292, मत्स्य 271, 15–16, ब्रह्माण्ड III. 74. 106; अत्रानुवंशश्लोकोऽयं गीतो विप्रैः पुराविदैः। ब्रह्मक्षत्रस्य यो योनिर्वंशो देवर्षिसत्कृतः। क्षेमकं प्राप्य राजानं संस्थां प्राप्स्यति वै कलौ॥ वायु 99. 278, ब्रह्माण्ड III. 74. 265, मत्स्य 51. 88. There is no अनुवंशश्लोक about the last scion of the third line.

1383. अत ऊर्ध्वं प्रवक्ष्यामि भविष्या ये नृपास्तथा। ऐडेक्ष्वाकान्वये चैव पौरवे चान्वये तथा। येषु संस्थास्यते तच्च ऐडेक्ष्वाकुकुलं शुभम्॥ तान्सर्वान् कीर्तयिष्यामि भविष्ये कथितान्नृपान्॥ तेभ्योऽपरेऽपि ये त्वन्ये ह्युत्पत्स्यन्ते नृपाः पुनः। क्षत्राः पारशवाः शूद्रास्तथान्ये ये बहिश्चराः। अन्धाः (अन्ध्राः ?) शकाः पुलिन्दाश्च चूलिका यवनास्तथा। कैवर्ताभीरशबरा ये चान्ये म्लेच्छसम्भवाः। पर्यायतः प्रवक्ष्यामि नामतश्चैव तान्नृपान्। अधिसोम(सीम ?)कृष्णश्चैतेषां प्रथमं वर्तते नृपः। तस्यान्ववाये वक्ष्यामि भविष्ये कथितान् नृपान्॥ मत्स्य 50. 73–77. Compare वायु 99.266–270 (the only important variants being भविष्ये पठितान्, सर्वाशतः for पर्यायतः and भविष्यं तावतो नृपान्). पारशवाः (पार्शवः or पर्शवः) probably stands for a warlike tribe called Parśus. Vide 'पर्श्वादियौधेयादिभ्यामणञौ' पा.V. 3 117, from which it appears that Parśu was an आयुधजीविसङ्घ like यौधेय in the times of Pāṇini. Parśus were ancient Persians, as appears from the Behustun Inscription of Darius (522–486 B. C.). Vide 'Select Inscriptions' vol. I. pp. 1–6 ed. by Dr. D. C. Sircar where Pars occurs as the name of a country. The other sense given above does not suit the context. Pulindas were in the Vindhya region and are associated with Andhra in the 13th Rock edict of Aśoka. The अमरकोश says: 'भेदाः किरातशबरपुलिन्दा म्लेच्छजातयः।'.

Kṣatriya class), Pāraśavas (the Parśi tribe or persons born of a śūdra father and brāhmaṇa mother?), Śūdras (as kings) and others that are foreigners, the Andhras, Śakas, Pulindas, Cūlikas, Yavanas, fishermen, Ābhīras and Śabaras and others born of Mleccha (tribes)—these kings I shall proclaim one after another in order and by name. Out of these (two groups) the first is Adhisīmakṛṣṇa who is now alive and I shall speak of the kings of his line that are narrated in the Bhaviṣya'. This passage makes it perfectly clear that in the ancient Bhaviṣyat kings of the three lines of Aila, Aikṣvāka and Paurava to the last of them were enumerated (vide note 1382), but that the later kings like the Āndhras and Śakas were not enumerated therein. I agree with Pargiter (p. VIII. in Intro. to 'Purāṇa Texts' &c.) that the words 'Bhaviṣye kathitān' in Matsya (50. 77) or 'Bhaviṣye paṭhitān' in Vāyu (in 99.292) refer to the descendants mentioned in the Bhaviṣya and that they do not simply mean 'mentioned in future.' I fail to understand, however, why he regards 'Bhaviṣyat' as a perversion of 'Bhaviṣya'. Bhaviṣyat is as good a word as Bhaviṣya, being employed in several passages such as Varāha (177. 34), Matsya (53. 62).

Pargiter probably wants to identify the Bhaviṣyat of Āpastamba with the Bhaviṣya of later times. There is no evidence except the name to identify the two. It, therefore, appears that the extant Purāṇas base their narrative as to the three lines of Aila, Aikṣvāka and Paurava kings on the materials contained in the ancient Bhaviṣya and as to other lines and comparatively later kings they relied on other materials or oral traditions that they could collect. This inference receives support from other circumstances. The extant Purāṇas quote verses called Anuvaṁśa ślokas or gāthās about ancient kings, such as Kārtavīrya (in Vāyu 94. 20, Matsya 43. 24, Brahmāṇḍa III. 68-20, Brahma 13. 17) and also about the last scions of the Aila and Aiksvāka lines, viz. Sumitra and Kṣemaka. But so far as kings of comparatively later dynasties such as those of the Āndhras, Śuṅgas and others are concerned, no such gāthās or ślokas are quoted in the Purāṇas. There is absolutely no evidence to hold, as Pargiter does (p. XIII of 'Purāṇa Texts' &c.), that the ancient Bhaviṣya contained a reference to the Guptas. The ancient Bhaviṣya was composed before Āpastamba (i. e. before the 4th or 5th B. C.) and hence originally could have contained no reference to the Guptas (whose rule began about 320 A. D.). The Matsya does not refer to the Guptas and mentions only the

downfall of the Āndhras. Therefore, the Matsya should be regarded as composed or revised about the middle (or end) of the 3rd century A. D., though the possibilities of some chapters or verses being added after that date cannot be ruled out. When the Vāyu (99. 383), Brahmāṇḍa (III. 74. 195), Viṣṇu (IV. 24. 18) and Bhāgavata (XII. 1. 37) mentioned the Guptas as rulers the first two probably added these passages just about the time when Gupta rule began and the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata (which present a corrupt text) might have borrowed the information from mss. of Vāyu or Brahmāṇḍa. It is clear, however, that the first two (out of the four) Purāṇas were composed or revised about 320–335 A. D. and the other two later still.

Kirfel's work 'Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa' is one of fundamental importance so far as the Purāṇas are concerned, since it adopts a new method for the treatment of Paurāṇika material. The German Introduction of this work has been reproduced in English in the Journal of the Shri Veṅkaṭeśa Institute at Tirupati, in vol. VII. pp. 81–121 and vol. VIII. pp. 9–33. Kirfel disagrees with many of the views of Pargiter. His main conclusions are: Apart from the abridgement in Agni and Garuḍa as well as the prose paraphrase in Viṣṇu, there are only three complete groups of Purāṇa texts viz. Brahma and Harivaṁśa, Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu, and that of Matsya, all other Purāṇas containing only smaller or larger parts of the same. Of the three groups, Brahmāṇḍa and Harivaṁśa are the oldest (and not Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu as Pargiter in A.I.H.T. p. 78 says). Kirfel holds that the Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu must have originally been a single Purāṇa, particularly because the largest parts of both agree with each other, that Pargiter is not right in thinking that the additions in Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa were borrowed from the ancient Bhaviṣya (Kirfel p. 18, vol. VII. of J. V. O. I. p. 92), but that the borrowed material goes back to an independent text. Kirfel does not accept Pargiter's theory that the Purāṇas were Sanskritizations of Prakrit texts, that the Viṣṇu in its existing form is a younger Purāṇa than the Vāyu or Brahmāṇḍa in spite of the fact that it most faithfully observes the basic arrangement of the five characteristics of Purāṇas. The division of Purāṇas into 18 and the distribution of Purāṇas into *sāttvika*, *rājasa* and *tāmasa* are not original items but are applicable only to the last definitive texts of the Purāṇas. Pargiter thought that there existed an Ur-Purāṇa which had treated of the five topics (of sarga &c.) in ideal completeness and clear disposition. Kirfel

says that this is scarcely more than an arbitrary assumption (p. XLVIII of Kirfel's Intro. and J. V. O. I. vol. VIII. p. 31).

The present author may tentatively accept most of the conclusions of Kirfel, but he differs as stated above from Kirfel's view that the five characteristic topics (*sarga &c.*) are the oldest constituent parts of the whole Purāṇa Literature.

A lengthy discussion of the age of the Purāṇas is not very relevant to the subject of this section. But it would not be entirely out of place if the author said a few words thereon.

The author's position about the Purāṇas is as follows: We know hardly anything about the Purāṇa mentioned in Atharvaveda, the Śatapatha and the ancient Upaniṣads; but this much is clear that Purāṇa had attained a status of sacredness like the Vedas and was closely associated with Itihāsa even in Vedic times. This is the first stage in the evolution of Purāṇa Literature, but we know nothing about the contents of the Purāṇa in those ancient times. The Tai. Ā. mentions *Purāṇāni*; therefore in its time there must have been three Purāṇas at least. As Āp. Dh. S. quotes four verses from a Purāṇa and expressly names Bhaviṣyatpurāṇa, it follows that by the 5th or 4th century B. C. at the latest there was in existence a Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa and other Purāṇas or a Purāṇa, that contained sarga and pratisarga and some Smṛti material. This we may regard as the 2nd definite stage of Purāṇa Literature, of the contents of which we have some traces at least.

The Mahābhārata quotes hundreds of verses (called *ślokas, gāthās, anuvaṁśa* ślokas), some of which have a bearing upon Paurāṇika subjects and have a Paurāṇika ring. Some examples may be cited. The Vanaparva[1384] quotes two verses about the spiritual prowess of Viśvāmitra and about his assertion that he was a brāhmaṇa. The Anuśāsanaparva[1385] quotes certain

1384. यत्रानुवंशं भगवान् जामदग्न्यस्तथा जगौ। विश्वामित्रस्य तां दृष्ट्वा विभूतिमतिमानुषीम्॥ कान्यकुब्जेऽपिबत्सोममिन्द्रेण सह कौशिकः। ततः क्षत्रादपाक्रामद् ब्राह्मणोस्मीति चाब्रवीत्॥ वनपर्व 87. 17–18. Brāhmaṇas alone were entitled to drink soma in a Vedic sacrifice and not Kṣatriyas. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1179.

1385. गाथाश्चाप्यत्र गायन्ति पितृगीता युधिष्ठिर। सनत्कुमारो भगवान्पुरा मय्यभ्यभाषत॥ अपि नः स कुले जायाद्यो नो दद्यात्त्रयोदशीम्। मघासु सर्पिःसंयुक्तं पायसं दक्षिणायने। आजेन वापि लौहेन मघास्वेव यतव्रतः। हस्तिच्छायासु विधिवत्कर्णव्यजनवीजितम्॥ एष्टव्या बहवः पुत्रा यद्येकोऽपि गयां व्रजेत्। अनुशासन 88. 11–14. Compare विष्णुपु० III. 16. 17–20, ब्रह्माण्ड III. 19. 10–11, वायु 83. 10–12, all of which have the half verse अपि नः··· शीम् as in अनुशासन. विष्णु and ब्रह्माण्ड add one half verse 'गौरीं वाप्युद्वहेत्कन्यां नीलं वा वृषमुत्सृजेत्।'.

gāthās said to have been sung by the pitṛs about the importance of a son or sons, which agree in letter and spirit with verses on the same subject in the Purāṇas. In the Udyoga-parva[1386] Bhīṣma is said to have addressed a verse to Paraśurāma that was sung by Marutta and declared in a Purāṇa. In the Purāṇas also there are frequent quotations of ślokas,[1387] gāthās and anuvaṁśaślokas sung by people described as *Paurāṇika* (in Vāyu 70. 76, 88. 114–116, 88. 168-169, Brahmāṇḍa III. 63. 69–70) or as *purāvidāḥ* or *purāṇajñāḥ* in Vāyu, 83. 171 and 95. 19, Brahmāṇḍa III. 63. 171). Vāyu (93. 94–101) mentions several gāthās as sung by Yayāti, most of which occur in the Ādiparva 75. 50–53 and 85. 12–15, Brahmāṇḍa III. 68. 96–103 and in other purāṇas also. It is quite possible that these gāthās and ślokas said to have been declared by those who knew Purāṇas were taken from the Purāṇa or Purāṇas known to Āpastamba. As Yāj. I. 3 regards Purāṇa as one of the sources of dharma, it follows that some Purāṇas containing smṛti material must have been composed a good deal before that smṛti i. e. before the 2nd or 3rd century A. D. at the latest. This is the third stage in the evolution of Purāṇas. It is difficult to say when the extant Matsya was originally composed but it was revised about the middle (or close) of the 3rd century A D., since it speaks of the downfall of the Āndhra dynasty, but does not refer to the Guptas. But it is possible that the original kernel of the Matsya may be earlier than this by a few centuries. The same applies to Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa. The Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa also were compiled or added to about 320–335 A. D., since they refer to the Guptas but do not name any Gupta king. These two in their present form may also be referred to this third stage. Most of the Mahāpurāṇas were composed or completed in the period from the 5th

---

1386. अयं चापि विशुद्धात्मन् पुराणे श्रूयते विभो । मरुत्तेन महाबुद्धे गीतः श्लोको महात्मना ॥ गुरोरप्यवलिप्तस्य कार्याकार्यमजानतः । उत्पथप्रतिपन्नस्य परित्यागो विधीयते ॥ उद्योग 178. 47–48. The cr. ed. has a wavy line below पुराणे and reads 'कार्यं भवति शासनम्' with a wavy line for परि…यते. This verse 'गुरो &c.' is शान्तिपर्व 140. 48 and is also शान्ति 57. 6–7, where it is said that it occurred in बृहस्पतिमत. आदिपर्व 140. 54 has this verse but reads the last पाद as न्याय्यं भवति शासनम् ।.

1387. भविष्यं कीर्तयिष्यामि शन्तनोस्तु निबोधत। …इदं चोदाहरन्त्यत्र श्लोकं प्रति महाभिषक् (भिषम्)। यं यं कराभ्यां स्पृशति जीर्णं रोगिणमेव वा। पुनर्युवा च भवति तस्मात्तं शन्तनुं विदुः॥ मत्स्य 50. 41–43, वायु 99. 238. The verse यं यं contains a popular etymology of the word शन्तनु. The word भविष्यं should mean only भविष्य-पुराण, since it is the सूत who says this and शन्तनु was a king anterior to सूत by some generations.

or 6th century A. D. to the 9th century A. D. This represents the 4th stage in the evolution of Purāṇa literature. The Upapurāṇas began to be compiled from about the 7th or 8th century A. D. and their numbers went on increasing till about the 13th century A. D. or even later. This is the last phase. Thus there is enough evidence to hold that the Purāṇas began to influence Hindu society a few centuries before Christ, that their influence continued in full force till the 17th or 18th century A. D. and that it continues to some extent even now. After the 9th century no further Mahāpurāṇas appear, but additional matter appears to have been unscrupulously inserted in several Purāṇas, the worst example of the kind being the third part of the Bhaviṣya, which contains stories of Adam and Eve, of Pṛthvīrāj and Jaicandra, Taimur, Akbar, Caitanya, Bhaṭṭoji, Nadirshah and so on.

The word 'purāṇa' occurs over a dozen times in the Ṛgveda, is an adjective and means 'ancient, old'. The Nighaṇṭu (III. 27) mentions six Vedic words as having the sense of 'purāṇa' viz. *pratnam, pradivaḥ, pravayāḥ, sanemi, pūrvyam, ahnāya.* Yāska (Nirukta III. 19) derives the word 'purāṇa' as 'purā navam bhavati' (what was new in former times). The Ṛgveda does not contain the word 'purātana' (ancient). Purāṇa may be a very old form of 'purātana' through the intermediate form 'purāaṇa.' From meaning ancient the word 'purāṇa' came to mean a work dealing with ancient tales; it became a noun and was applied in the times of the Atharvaveda, the Śatapatha and the Upaniṣads to a class of works containing ancient tales. When purāṇa came to mean a work dealing with ancient tales, to speak of a Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa was apparently a contradiction in terms. That contradiction was probably not minded or was ignored by the thought that works that narrated old tales gradually came to include comparatively recent ones and had therefore to adopt a prophetic style of composition with reference to the latter.

The Vāyu[1388] derives the word 'Purāṇa' from 'purā' (in ancient times, formerly) and the root 'an' (to breathe or live), and therefore according to it the word literally means 'that which lives in the past' or 'that which breathes ancient times'.

1388. यस्मात्पुरा ह्यनतीदं पुराणं तेन तत्स्मृतम्। निरुक्तमस्य यो वेद सर्वपापैः प्रमुच्यते। वायु I. 203; पुरा परम्परां वष्टि पुराणं तेन वै स्मृतम्। पद्म V. 2. 53; the ब्रह्माण्ड I. 1. 173 has यस्मात्पुरा ह्यभूच्चैतत्पुराणं तेन तत्स्मृतम्। निरुक्त...मुच्यते॥

The Padmapurāṇa propounds a slightly different etymology, viz. "it is called Purāṇa because it desires or likes the past" from 'purā' and the root 'vaś' (to desire or to like).

The question why the extant Purāṇas do not narrate the traditions about the dynasties of the Guptas and their successors cannot be satisfactorily answered. One reason may be that the original kernel of some Purāṇas like the extant Matsya were compiled before the Guptas rose to power, while others like the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa were compiled while the Gupta rule was in its infancy. Another reason may have been that in the 5th and following centuries when many of the extant Purāṇas were compiled northern India was very much disturbed by the invasions of foreigners like the Hūṇas, [1389] Toramāṇa and Mihirakula, numerous sects and schisms had arisen, Buddhism had become powerful and therefore the first task of the intelligent and devout followers of the Veda was held to be to wean the common people away from schisms like that of Buddha, to lay down the foundations of a new ideology among the masses and to emphasize and assimilate as many of the doctrines of the sects and schisms as possible with their ancient traditions and practices. The intelligent classes, therefore, emphasized the importance of such virtues as ahiṁsā, satya, bhakti and of vratas, pilgrimages, śrāddhas and dānas and were probably not in a mood to record the names of foreign conquerors or of small chieftains fighting with each other and unable to repel the cruel invaders. For the absence of references to the dynasties of the Guptas and their successors, Pargiter blames the brāhmaṇas in the following characteristic passage (AIHT chap. 4 p. 57) 'the absolute dearth of traditional history after that stage is quite intelligible, both because the compilation of the Purāṇa had set a seal of tradition and because the Purāṇa soon passed into the hands of brāhmaṇas who preserved what they had received, but with the brahmanic lack of the historic sense, added nothing about the later kings'. Supposing for argument that brāhmaṇas lacked the historic sense, Pargiter's opinion appears to be entirely one-sided. He assigns no reason why the sūtas, whose business was to record and preserve historic tradition (as he himself says on p. 58 of AIHT), did not stick to their business and did not continue to compose genealogies of

1389. For the history of the ruthless Hūṇa invader Mihirakula, vide Gupta Inscriptions pp. 143–148 and 149 ff (Mandasor Inscription of Yaśodharman) and pp. 924–25 note 1788 a, of vol. III. of H. of Dh.

later kings and to add further items of history to already existing recorded tradition, nor does he explain how the sūtas could be ousted or allowed themselves to be ousted from their age-old avocation by the brāhmaṇas. It is probable that foreign dynasties like that of Kaniṣka and the Hūṇas did not encourage the sūtas who had sunk low in the social scale and the sūtas probably became Buddhists, as Buddhism with its Jātaka stories gave to all persons following a bardic profession sufficient scope for earning their livelihood.

The legends about Vyāsa and Sūta may be briefly considered. The Purāṇas declare that Vyāsa was the son of Parāśara, was also called Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana and was an incarnation of Viṣṇu (of Brahmā also in Vāyu 77. 74–75 and of Śiva in the Kūrma II. 11. 136). He was called Dvaipāyana[1390] because he was born on an island (dvīpa) in the Yamunā river and Kṛṣṇa because he was of dark complexion. His mother was Satyavatī and son was Śuka. He was called Vyāsa because he is supposed to have divided or arranged the one Veda into four parts (from the root 'as' 4th conjugation 'to throw' with the upasarga 'vi'). He instructed four disciples in the four Vedas, viz. Paila, Vaiśampāyana, Jaimini and Sumantu respectively in Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, Sāmaveda and Atharvaveda. His 5th disciple was Sūta Romaharṣaṇa to whom was imparted Itihāsa-Purāṇa. The son of Sūta was Sauti who narrated the Mahābhārata to Śaunaka and other sages in the Naimiṣa forest. It was believed that whenever *dharma* and Veda declined Vyāsas were born for the benefit of men (Brahma 158. 34). The Kūrma (I. 52. 1–9) sets out 27 names of different Vyāsas, while Vāyu (23. 115–219), Brahmāṇḍa (II. 35. 116–125), Viṣṇu[1391] (III. 3. 11–19)

1390. अस्मिन्युगे कृतो व्यासः पाराशर्यः परन्तपः (परन्तप?)। द्वैपायन इति ख्यातो विष्णोरंशः प्रकीर्तितः॥ ब्रह्मणा चोदितः सोऽस्मिन्वेदं व्यस्तुं प्रचक्रमे। अथ शिष्यान् स जग्राह चतुरो वेदकारणात्॥ ···ऋग्वेदश्रावकं पैलं जग्राह विधिवद् द्विजम्। यजुर्वेदप्रवक्तारं वैशम्पायनमेव च। जैमिनिं सामवेदार्थं श्रावकं सोऽन्वपद्यत। तथैवाथर्ववेदस्य सुमन्तुमृषिसत्तमम्। इतिहासपुराणस्य वक्तारं सम्यगेव हि। मां चैव प्रतिजग्राह भगवानीश्वरः प्रभुः॥ वायु 60.11–16, ब्रह्माण्ड II. 34. 11–16 (almost in the same words). Compare विष्णु III. 4. 7–10, कूर्म I. 52. 12-15, विष्णुधर्मोत्तर I. 74. Kūrma I. 51. 48, Padma V. 1. 43, Bhāgavata I. 4. 14–25 and XII. 6. 49–80 and Nāradīya I. 1. 18 identify him with Nārāyaṇa. The आदिपर्व corroborates the Purāṇa statements: विव्यासैकं चतुर्धा यो वेदं वेदविदां वरः। आदि 60. 2 and 5; यो व्यस्य वेदांश्चतुरस्तपसा भगवानृषिः। लोके व्यासत्वमापेदे कार्ष्ण्यात्कृष्णत्वमेव च। आदि 105. 15.

1391. द्वापरे द्वापरे विष्णुर्व्यासरूपी महामुने। वेदमेकं सुबहुधा कुरुते जगतो हितः॥ वीर्यं तेजो बलं चाल्पं मनुष्याणामवेक्ष्य च। हिताय सर्वभूतानां वेदभेदान् करोति सः॥ विष्णु III. 3. 5–6.

enumerate the names of the 28 Vyāsas of the 28 Dvāpara ages of the Vaivasvata Manvantara (which is the current one). How Vyāsa put together the Purāṇas is described in several Purāṇas 'He who was an adept in the meaning of Purāṇa composed a Purāṇa-saṁhitā from (the material supplied by) tales, episodes, gāthās (stanzas) and correct ascertainment or descriptions of Kalpas'.[1392] This shows that, while the Vedic texts were preserved with unparalleled care by the brāhamaṇas, the very ancient Itihāsa-purāṇa, though called the 5th Veda, was not kept intact with care similar to that bestowed on the four Vedas and that this fifth Veda was allowed to be inflated by fresh additions from time to time.

In connection with Vyāsa's legendary role as an arranger of the Veda, Pargiter has a theory of his own which must be briefly noticed and examined. He develops that theory on pp. 9–10 of A. I. H. T. He refers to the Ṛgveda as the greatest brahmanical book, says that it is a compilation of hymns composed by many authors and is arranged according to certain principles. His words are 'It (Ṛgveda) must manifestly have been compiled and arranged by some one or more persons, yet Vedic Literature says absolutely nothing about this. The brāhmaṇas cannot have been ignorant about it, for they preserved it and its text with unparalleled care. ...Vedic Literature professes to know and declares the names of the authors of nearly all the hymns and even of single verses, yet it ignores all knowledge of the person or persons who afterwards compiled and arranged these hymns. To suppose that when it preserved the earlier information it was ignorant of the later work in so vital a matter is ridiculous.' From this silence in the Vedic Literature about the persons that compiled and arranged the Ṛgveda, Pargiter at once jumps to the positive and emphatic conclusion, as is usual with many western writers on Sanskrit Literature and Indology to argue from silence, that 'Vedic Literature has deliberately suppressed all information on these matters' (AIHT p. 9). He refers to the fact that the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas are full of Vyāsa and repeatedly declare that the Veda was arranged by Vyāsa and points out that Vedic Literature is

---

1392. आख्यानैश्चाप्युपाख्यानैर्गाथाभिः कल्पशुद्धिभिः। पुराणसंहितां चक्रे पुराणार्थविशारदः॥ विष्णु III. 6. 15, ब्रह्माण्ड II. 34. 21 (reads कल्पजोक्तिभिः), वायु 60. 21 (reads कुलकर्मभिः). कल्पजोक्तिभिः would mean 'words or descriptions relating to Kalpas (vast periods of time)'. The com. on विष्णुपुराण explains 'स्वयं दृष्टार्थकथनं प्राहुराख्यानकं बुधाः। श्रुतस्यार्थस्य कथनमुपाख्यानं प्रचक्षते॥'

remarkably reticent about Vyāsa Pārāśarya (who is mentioned as a pupil of Viṣvaksena in the Vaṁśa list at the end of the Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa and in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka) and then he reiterates his charge of the conspirary of silence about Vyāsa (AIHT. p. 10). Pargiter is ready with a reason for the supposed conspiracy of silence viz. 'the brāhmaṇas put forward the doctrine that the Veda existed from everlasting; hence to admit that any one had compiled or even arranged it struck at the root of their doctrine and was in common parlance to give their whole case away' (*ibid.* p. 10).

Several objections can be raised against the positive assertion of deliberate and fraudulent suppression inferred from mere silence. In the first place, Pargiter is very loose in his statement of facts. Pargiter totally ignores that even in the Ṛgveda itself, ṛk verses, yajus texts and sāman chants are differentiated. To give only a few references, vide for Ṛks (Ṛg. II. 35. 12, V. 6. 5, V. 27. 4, V. 44. 14–15), in both verses of the last ṛk and sāmans being separately mentioned; for *yajus vide* Ṛg. V. 62. 5, X. 181. 3); for sāman chants *vide* Ṛg. II. 43. 2 (*udgāteva* śakune *sāma gāyasi*), VIII. 81. 5 (*śravat sāma gīyamānam*), VIII. 95. 7 (śuddhena *sāmnā*).

The epic and purānic texts indicate that Veda was thought to be originally one, but was arranged into four groups, that the four groups of texts were entrusted for preservation and propagation to four different disciples of Vyāsa. The Ṛgveda has two arrangements, one into *maṇḍalas* and *sūktas* and the other into *aṣṭakas*, *adhyāyas* and *vargas*. The Taittirīyasaṁhitā and Atharvaveda are arranged into kāṇḍas. Not a word is said in any of these accounts to which Pargiter refers about picking up hymns already existing or their being arranged in maṇḍalas or adhyāyas or kāṇḍas by Vyāsa. Further, the reason assigned for the supposed deliberate suppression of the name of the arranger of the Veda is quite flimsy, not to say ridiculous. Every hymn of the Ṛgveda or every mantra has a ṛṣi who by the ancient Indian tradition was not the *author* (as Pargiter puts it) but only the *seer*. It is clear from Brāhmaṇa texts, Upaniṣads and smṛtis that from very[1393] ancient times it was a very strict principle

1393. ऋष्यादिज्ञानाभावे प्रत्यवायः स्मर्यते। अविदित्वा ऋषिं छन्दो दैवतं योगमेव च। योऽध्यापयेज्जपेद्वापि पापीयाञ्जायते तु सः॥ सायण in his Introduction to the भाष्य on ऋग्वेद edited by the Poona Vaidika-saṁśodhana Maṇḍala. योग in the verse means विनियोग. 'आर्षं छन्दश्च दैवत्यं विनियोगस्तथैव च। वेदितव्यं प्रयत्नेन ब्राह्मणेन विशेषतः॥'.

(*Continued on next page*)

that no one should teach or repeat in japa or employ a mantra in a sacrifice without knowing the ṛṣi, the metre, the deity and the use (viniyoga) of it and dire consequences were declared to follow for him who was remiss in these matters. Hymns and mantras were arranged in different groups for different religious rites and solemn sacrifices or for other purposes (such as śāntis). It is not necessary to remember who arranged the required mantras for rites, sacrifices and other purposes. The Brāhmaṇa texts and śrauta sūtras prescribe the manner of the employment of the same mantras for various purposes and the Anukramaṇīs contain the names of the seers, metres and the deities of hymns and individual mantras also. As every mantra of the Veda was supposed to be only *seen* by a sage and as eternal, the mere compilation of them in one or more series or the mere arrangement of mantras or hymns in different groups for different purposes did not at all affect or interfere with the eternality of mantras or hymns. Pargiter's so-called reason for suppressing the name of the arranger of the Veda is simply no reason at all.

Pargiter did not stop to consider possible explanations. One of the most plausible is now put forth. The Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas (a very extensive literature) were attributed to Vyāsa, who, as shown above in n. 1390, had come to be looked upon as Viṣṇu or as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu. The four Vedas and the several different śākhās (recensions) of each Veda were well known. By a sort of *post facto* explanation, the distribution of the Veda into four main groups was claimed to have been brought about by the divinely inspired Vyāsa, whose Purāṇas are, as will be apparent from note 1349 above and as will be shown in more detail later, glorified as even anterior and superior to the Veda. The eternality of the Veda had to be maintained and at the same time Vyāsa was to be glorified.

(*Continued from last page*)

This is बृहद्योगियाज्ञवल्क्य I. 27 quoted also by हेमाद्रि on व्रत vol. I p. 247. शङ्कराचार्य in his भाष्य on ब्रह्मसूत्र I. 3. 30 quotes the following as a Vedic text which occurs several times in the Ait. Br. 'यो ह वा अविदितार्षेयच्छन्दोदैवतब्राह्मणेन मन्त्रेण याजयति वाध्यापयति वा स्थाणुं वर्च्छति गर्तं वा प्रतिपद्यते'''तस्मादेतानि मन्त्रे मन्त्रे विद्यात्'. Vide also छान्दोग्योपनिषद् I. 3. 8-10 'येन साम्ना स्तोष्यन्स्यात्तत्सामोपधावेत्। यस्यामृचि तामृचं यदार्षेयं तमृषिं यां देवतामभिष्टोष्यन्स्यात्तां देवतामुपधावेत्। येन छन्दसा स्तोष्यन्स्यात्तच्छन्द उपधावेत्'. Vide note 1276 for the ऐ. ब्रा. passage which requires that the mantra employed should refer to the rite that is being performed.

The easiest way was to proclaim that Vyāsa, the author of the great Epic and of the distribution of Purāṇas into eighteen, was also responsible for the division or arrangement of the Veda. If all this glorification of Vyāsa occurred in the centuries immediately preceding and following Christ, how could the supposed arranger of the Veda be mentioned in the early Vedic Literature, which, most scholars agree, was closed some centuries before Buddha (i. e. before the 6th century B. C.)? No body claims that the arrangement into maṇḍalas or aṣṭakas or kāṇḍas is eternal. It is only the hymns or mantras that are claimed to be eternal. Even the *padapāṭha* of the Ṛgveda is declared to be non-eternal and is ascribed to Śākalya whom the Nirukta criticises in VI. 28. Viśvarūpa on Yāj. III. 242 expressly states that the *pada* and *krama* arrangements of the Veda are due to human authors.[1394] This theory explains all matters and has far better claims to be accepted than Pargiter's bold ascription of fraudulent suppression inferred from (a supposed) silence.

The Purāṇas do not speak with one voice about their own origin and transmission. After declaring that Vyāsa entrusted the preservation and propagation of the Purāṇas to Sūta, the Vāyu and other Purāṇas contain a somewhat different version. The Vāyu narrates (61. 55-61): Sūta had six disciples, viz. Sunīti Ātreya, Akṛtavraṇa Kāśyapa, Agnivarcas Bhārdvāja, Mitrayu Vasiṣṭha, Sāvarṇi Saumadatti, Suśarman Śāṁśapāyana. Three of these, viz. Kāśyapa, Sāvarṇi and Śāṁśapāyana prepared new Purāṇa-saṁhitās and Sūta's own was the 4th and the original one. All were divided into four *kāṇḍas*, contained the same sense (matter), but differed in their readings as the *śākhās* of the Veda differ. All had four thousand verses except the saṁhitā of Śāṁśapāyana. These four are said to be the basic saṁhitās (in Brahmāṇḍa II. 35. 66) or original saṁhitās (in Vāyu 61. 58 pūrvasaṁhitās). The Brahmāṇḍa (II. 35. 63-70) has the same account in almost in the same words. Viṣṇu (III. 6. 16-17), Agni 271 (11-12) are briefer but agree in the main with Vāyu. The Bhāgavāta (XII. 7. 4-7) differs from all these to some extent. That there is some substance in this story appears from stray passages in several chapters of the Vāyu (56. 1, 60. 33-34, 62. 1, 89. 16) and the Brahmāṇḍa (II. 34. 34,

---

1394. पदक्रमादीनां तु पुरुषकृतत्वादेव व्याहृतेर्न तद्विद्वस्यर्थं संहितावचनम्। बालक्रीडा on या. III. 242 'अरण्ये नियतो जप्त्वा त्रिष्कृत्वो वेदसंहिताम्.' शान्ति 343. 103 (= cr. ed. 330.37) states the क्रमपाठ was due to पाञ्चाल बाभ्रव्य.

II. 36. 1 &c.), where Śaṁśampāyana is the inquirer and Sūta replies.

The personality of Sūta is somewhat of an enigma in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. Sūta is called Romaharṣaṇa[1395] or Lomaharṣaṇa because he made the hair (*roman* or *loman*) of his audience bristle or stand erect by his touching and eloquent speech. In the Skanda it is stated that he was so called because his own hair stood on end when he was being instructed by Dvaipāyana. One meaning of the word *sūta* is 'chrioteer' and another meaning is 'a person of a mixed *pratiloma* caste born of the union of a brāhmaṇa woman with a kṣatriya male' and the cognate word 'Māgadha' means 'one who is born of a pratiloma union between a vaiśya male and a kṣatriya female' (vide Manu X. 71. Yāj. I. 93-94). The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya says[1396] the same thing about sūta and māgadha, but adds that 'the sūta and māgadha mentioned in the Purāṇas are different from these, because he (the sūta) is distinguished from (ordinary) brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas'. Kauṭilya means that in his days sūta and māgadha were *pratiloma* castes, but the sūta and māgadha mentioned as the first reciters of the Purāṇas are a category apart, that they do not belong to the pratiloma castes and are both distinguished from brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas (i. e. sūta of the Purāṇās is treated more or less as a great sage or semi-divine person). The Vāyu (1. 26-33 and 62-147 ff), Padma (II. 27. 65-87, V. 1. 29-32), Brahmāṇḍa (II. 36. 158-173), the Skanda (Prabhāsakhaṇḍa 1. 8) say[1397] that in the sacrifice of Pitāmaha (i. e. Brahmā) Sūta sprang up as a partial *avatāra* of Viṣṇu on

---

1395. लोमानि हर्षयांचक्रे श्रोतॄणां यत्सुभाषितैः। कर्मणा प्रथितस्तेन लोकेऽस्मिँल्लोमहर्षणः। वायु 1. 16; तस्य ते सर्वरोमाणि वचसा हर्षितानि यत्। द्वैपायनस्यानुभावात्ततोभूद्रोमहर्षणः॥ स्कन्द (प्रभासखण्ड) 1. 6.

1396. वैश्यान्मागधवैदेहकौ। क्षत्रियात्सूतः। पौराणिकस्त्वन्यः सूतो मागधश्च ब्रह्मक्षत्राद्विशेषतः॥ अर्थशास्त्र III. 7. p. 165; Pargiter translates (AIHT p. 17) 'but the sūta who is mentioned in the Purāṇas is different and so also is the Māgadha *who is mentioned there* from brāhmaṇa-kṣatriya offspring by a *real* distinction.' This is not accurate. There are no words in the Arthaśāstra corresponding to 'who is mentioned there' and for 'offspring'. This idea about the origin of सूत and मागध is very old. Vide गौ. धर्मसूत्र IV. 15-16 'प्रतिलोमास्तु सूतमागधायोगवकृत-वैदेहकचण्डालाः। ब्राह्मण्यजीजनत्पुत्रान् वर्णेभ्य आनुपूर्व्याद् ब्राह्मण-सूत-मागध-चण्डालान्।.

1397. एतस्मिन्नेव काले च यज्ञे पैतामहे शुभे। सूतो सुत्यां समुत्पन्नो सौत्येऽहनि महामतिः॥ तस्मिन्नेव महायज्ञे जज्ञे प्राज्ञोथ मागधः। वायु 62. 135-136, ब्रह्म 4. 60-61. It is popular etymology to derive the word सूत from the root 'su' 5th conj. to extract.

the day when soma juice was extracted and māgadha also thus arose. It is further stated in the same Purāṇas that the *havis* (offering) meant for Indra (symbol of the kṣatriya class) got mixed with that meant for Bṛhaspati (symbol of brāhmaṇa class and learning) and that the sūta was born just at the time when the mixed-up offering was presented to the gods. From this the sūta (in later times) had duties similar to those of the original sūta and it was said that the sūta is offspring of the mixed union of brāhmaṇa (woman) with kṣatriya (male). Then another story is grafted on to this (in Vāyu 62. 147 ff, Brahmāṇḍa II. 36. 170-173 and in others) that the original[1398] Sūta and Māgadha sang the praises of king Pṛthu, son of Vena, who being pleased, made a present of the country of Anūpa to Sūta and the country of Magadha to Māgadha and since that time sūtas and māgadhas sing the praises of kings and awaken them in the morning with blessings. The Vāyu itself,[1399] however, says (1. 33-34) that sūta was born at the time of the extracting of soma juice in the sacrifice of Pṛthu Vainya.

The authors of the extant Vāyu and other Purāṇas are conscious that the sūta and māgadha in their times had no adhikāra for Veda, that the business of the sūta was to note the dynasties of gods, sages and kings that are found in the Itihāsa and Purāṇas. They felt scandalized by the fact that great sages like Śaunaka were said to have learnt Purāṇas from the sūta who in their times belonged to a pratiloma caste, about which Gautama, Viṣṇudharmasūtra and Kauṭilya himself lay down that pratilomas are like śūdras, are condemned by āryas and are

---

1398. ततः स्तवान्ते सुप्रीतः पृथुः प्रादात्प्रजेश्वरः। अनूपदेशं सूताय मगधं मागधाय च॥ तदा वै पृथिवीपालाः स्तूयन्ते सूतमागधैः। आशीर्वादैः प्रबोध्यन्ते सूतमागधबन्दिभिः॥ वायु 62. 147-148, ब्रह्माण्ड II. 36. 171-173. The आदिपर्व (59. 112-113) refers to the gift of अनूप and मगध to सूत and मागध; ब्रह्मपु॰ 4. 67 also does so. The Padma V. 1. 31 says that Pṛthu made a present of the Sūta country to सूत. It is popular etymology to derive the name मागध from मगध. अनूप means a watery or marsh country. Padma (II. 27. 86-87) mentions other countries as gifts to सूत &c.

1399. सूत उवाच। '''स्वधर्म एष सूतस्य सद्भिर्दिष्टः पुरातनैः। देवतानामृषीणां च राज्ञां चामिततेजसाम्॥ वंशानां धारणं कार्यं श्रुतानां च महात्मनाम्। इतिहासपुराणेषु दिष्टा ये ब्रह्मवादिभिः॥ न हि वेदेष्वधीकारः कश्चित्सूतस्य दृश्यते। वैन्यस्य हि पृथोर्यज्ञे वर्तमाने महात्मनः। सुत्यायामभवत्सूतः प्रथमं वर्णवैकृतः। वायु 1. 31-34, पद्म V. 1. 27; vide ब्रह्माण्ड II. 36. 158-173 for the birth of सूत and gift of अनूपदेश to सूत and of मगध to मागध by पृथुवैन्य. प्रतिलोमास्तु धर्महीनाः। गौतमधर्मसूत्र (IV. 20); त एते प्रतिलोमाः स्वधर्मातिक्रमाद्राज्ञः सम्भवन्ति। '''शूद्रसधर्माणो वा अन्यत्र चण्डालेभ्यः। अर्थशास्त्र III. 7 p. 165; प्रतिलोमास्त्वार्यविगर्हिताः। विष्णुधर्मसूत्र 16. 3.

beyond the pale of the usual duties of brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas (such as *upanayana*, Veda study, teaching &c.). Learning by a brāhmaṇa from a kṣatriya was considered even in Upaniṣad times as contrary to the natural order of things. Vide the words of king Ajātaśatru to Gārgya Bālāki[1400] quoted below. Therefore, to account for the position of Sūta as instructor in Itihāsa and Purāṇa of great sages like Śaunaka, the story of Sūta's birth was invented and he was placed in a separate category by himself. This must have occurred some centuries before Kauṭilya who was aware of the low position of sūta and māgadha and differentiates the Paurāṇika sūta from the pratiloma sūta and māgadha. One need not accept the divine character of Sūta, one has only to understand that in very ancient times brāhmaṇas could, without any qualms and without loss of prestige, learn about legends from a sūta, but that in the times when the extant purāṇas were compiled the position had entirely changed.

Next to Pargiter and Kirfel, one must mention the name of Prof. R. C. Hazra who has bestowed much labour and thought on the purāṇas in general and on individual purāṇas. One cannot but feel high admiration for Prof. Hazra's industry, patience and enthusiasm. One regrets, however, to find that he has developed a tendency to assign rather more ancient dates to the extant Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas than the available evidence would warrant. Besides, he has been so much engrossed in the study of Purāṇas that he sometimes scents a reference to Purāṇas where none in fact exists. For example, in 'Puranic records on Hindu rites and customs' (p. 6) Prof. Hazra observes that Vijñāneśvara tells us of Hārīta's reference to the opinion of Purāṇas in prescribing penance in normal circumstances to those who eat the food dedicated to the patriarchs. The words of the Mitākṣarā[1401] of Vijñāneśvara are quoted in the note

---

1400. सहोवाचाजातशत्रुः प्रतिलोमं चैतद्यद् ब्राह्मणः क्षत्रियमुपेयाद् ब्रह्म मे वक्ष्यतीति। बृह. उ. II. 1. 15. Vide कौषीतकिब्रा. उ. IV. 18 for almost the same words.

1401. The मिताक्षरा has a long discussion on Yāj. III. 289 about the expiations for eating food tainted by various defects. About eating food in śrāddhas of various kinds it quotes several authorities as follows: हारीतेनाप्युक्तम्। एकादशाहे भुक्त्वान्नं भुक्त्वा सञ्चयने तथा। उपोष्य विधिवत्स्नात्वा कूष्माण्डैर्जुहुयाद्घृतम्॥ इति। विष्णुनाप्युक्तम्। प्राजापत्यं नवश्राद्धे...पञ्चगव्यं द्विमासिके॥ इदं चापद्विषयम्। अनापदि तु—'चान्द्रायणं नवश्राद्धे प्राजापत्यं तु मिश्रके। एकाहस्तु पुराणेषु प्राजापत्यं विधीयते॥ इति हारीतोक्तं द्रष्टव्यम्। प्राजापत्यं तु मिश्रके इत्येतदाद्यमासिकविषयं द्रष्टव्यम्।

(*Continued on next page*)

below and clearly show that there the word '*purāṇeṣu*' means 'Śrāddhas called purāṇa' and has nothing to do with Purāṇa works. Another defect noticed in Prof. Hazra's writings is that he sees too much meaning in simple words and phrases and is not cautious in his conclusions as a scholar of his standing and experience should be. In a recent paper on 'the Aśvamedha, the common source of origin of the Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa and the Mahābhārata' in ABORI, vol. 36 (1956) pp. 190–203, he cites the Atharvaveda verse quoted above (p. 816, n 1325) in which ṛk and sāma verses are mentioned separately and 'purāṇa' (purāṇaṁ yajuṣā saha) is associated with *yajus*, and says this collocation seemed to him highly significant and that he felt *fully convinced* that the Purāṇa pañcalakṣaṇa and the Mahābhārata owe their origin to the Aśvamedha sacrifice and especially to its Pāriplava ākhyānas. Reasons of available space preclude a detailed examination of this paper. But a few fundamental objections and matters must be mentioned. The words 'purāṇaṁ yajuṣā saha' should ordinarily mean (as in passages like Devadattaḥ saputra āgataḥ) no more than 'Purāṇa and Yajus'. Yāj. 1. 101 provides[1402] that after the daily bath, a vedic householder should undertake every day the japa of portions of the (three) Vedas, the Atharvaveda, Purāṇas together with Itihāsa and of ādhyātmikī-vidyā (Upaniṣads). There is no special meaning here in the association 'purāṇāni setihāsāni' beyond 'Purāṇas and Itihāsa'. One, therefore, fails to understand how the words 'purāṇam yajuṣā saha' are highly significant for arriving at the *conviction* that Aśvamedha is the origin of Purāṇa and Mahābhārata. Then on p. 202 of the paper

---

(Continued from last page)

Srāddhas are of three kinds, नवश्राद्ध (up to ten days after death), मिश्र or नवमिश्र (performed after ten days up to one year) and पुराण (those performed after a year from a person's death). The word पुराणेषु means पुराणेषु श्राद्धेषु. हारीत provides प्रायश्चित्त for eating the food in the three kinds of श्राद्धs, नव, मिश्र and पुराण. The word पुराणेषु in that verse of हारीत has nothing to do with Purāṇa works. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. p. 262 notes 591a and 593 for more details about the three kinds of śrāddhas.

1402. वेदाथर्वपुराणानि सेतिहासानि शक्तितः। जपयज्ञप्रसिद्ध्यर्थं विद्यां चाध्यात्मिकीं जपेत्॥ याज्ञ. I. 101. Compare also कूर्म II. 46. 129 एकतस्तु पुराणानि सेतिहासानि कृत्स्नशः। एकत्र परमं वेदमेतदेवातिरिच्यते॥.

in question Prof. Hazra quotes a passage from[1403] Śaṅkarācārya's bhāṣya on Chāndogya III. 4. 1–2 and completely misunderstands the great ācārya when he observes "Śaṅkara's use of the word 'rātri' in the plural (in 'rātriṣu') shows that in his opinion the *Itihāsa and Purāṇa were employed every night during the Pāriplava and not merely on the 8th and 9th nights respectively*, as the Śatapatha Br. and Śāṅkhāyanaśrautasūtra say" (Italics author's). The Aśvamedha sacrifice lasted for a year and listening to the Pāriplava went on for a year, each Pāriplava being a cycle of ten days (or rather nights, as the recitation by the hotṛ priest was to take place after the morning, mid-day and evening iṣṭis to Savitṛ were finished). The texts to be recited and the nature of the legends to be narrated on each of the cycle of ten days are fixed and Itihāsa and Purāṇa are to be recited only on the 8th and 9th nights. As each cycle was of ten days, there would be 36 cycles of Pāriplava in a year and Itihāsa would be recited on 36 nights in the year and Purāṇa also would be recited on 36 nights in the year. It is for this reason that Śaṅkarācārya speaks of 'Pāriplavāsu rātriṣu' in the plural, but he does not say that Itihāsa and Purāṇa were to be recited on 'all' nights (*sarvāsu* rātriṣu), while Prof. Hazra represents him as so saying. There is absolutely no warrant in the ancient texts for saying that on each day (or night) of the Pāriplava Itihāsa or Purāṇa was to be recited or that Śaṅkarācārya said anything of the kind. The testimony of the Vedāntasūtra[1404] is completely against this view of Prof. Hazra. Vedāntasūtra III. 4. 23 refers to certain stories mentioned in the Upaniṣads such as 'Yājñavalkya had two wives, Maitreyī and Kātyāyanī' (Bṛ. Up. IV. 5. 1), 'Pratardana, son of Divodāsa, went to Indra's abode' (Kauṣītaki Up. III. 1), 'Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa was a pious donor giving much wealth to the people and keeping an open house for distributing food' (Chān. Up. IV. 1. 1), and remarks that such stories were not to be recited in Pāriplava, since the stories to be recited therein are expressly specified beginning with the story

---

1403. The भाष्य passage quoted is 'इतिहासपुराणं पुष्पम्। तयोश्चेतिहासपुराणयोरश्वमेधे पारिप्लवासु रात्रिषु कर्माङ्गत्वेन विनियोगः सिद्धः'.

1404. पारिप्लवमाचक्षीत-इति हि प्रकृत्य 'मनुर्वैवस्वतो राजा' इत्येवमादीनि कानिचिदेवाख्यानानि तत्र विशेष्यन्ते। आख्यानसामान्याच्चेत्सर्वगृहीतिः स्यादनर्थकमेवेदं विशेषणं भवेत्। तस्मान्न पारिप्लवार्था एता आख्यानश्रुतयः। भाष्य on वे. सू. III. 4. 23 (पारिप्लवार्था इति चेन्न विशेषितत्वात्).

of king Manu Vaivasvata (which was to be recited on the first night of the Pāriplava).

Prof. Hazra has recently published (in 1958) 'Studies in the Upapurāṇas' vol. I. pp. 1-400 on Saura and Vaiṣṇava Upapurāṇas (in the Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series 1958). This would be briefly dealt with a little later.

Prof. Ramchandra Dikshitar also has written a good deal on the Purāṇas. His writings are beset by the same infirmity that attaches to Prof. Hazra's work to some extent. For example, in a paper published in the Proceedings of the 13th Indian History Congress (pp. 46-50) on the Viṣṇupurāṇa he first states (p. 46) that he is more concerned with the extant Viṣṇupurāṇa and after pointing out that the topics of vratas, of fasts, of tīrtha, are absent from the extant Viṣṇupurāṇa he concludes that the extant Viṣṇupurāṇa can safely be placed *in the 6th or 7th century B. C.* Hardly any modern and critical scholar would accept such a date for the extant Viṣṇupurāṇa. Instead of relying on the absence of certain topics he should rather have relied on what it actually contains to find out the probable date of the extant Viṣṇupurāṇa.

In connection with the Purāṇas the author must refer at some length to the Introductory remarks of Ballālasena, king of Bengal, in his Dānasāgara, edited in the B. I. series (1953-1956) by Mr. Bhabatosh Bhaṭṭācārya (three parts of text pp. 1-722 and 4th part an Introduction in English with Indices). Those remarks evince a bold critical faculty rare in our medieval Sanskrit writers. He mentions, besides the Gopathabrāhmaṇa, the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata, the smṛtis and dharmaśāstras of Gautama, Manu, Yājñavalkya, (counting Śaṅkha Likhita as two), Dāna-Bṛhaspati and Bṛhaspati (as separate), Vasiṣṭha and others (in all 28), the Chandoga-pariśiṣṭa of Kātyāyana, thirteen principal Purāṇas viz. Brāhma, Vārāha, Āgneya, Bhaviṣya, Mātsya, Vāmana, *Vāyavīya*, Mārkaṇḍeya, Vaiṣṇava, *Śaiva*, Skānda, Pādma and Kaurma and the Upapurāṇas named in Kūrma and Ādi Purāṇas as containing the procedure of (various) dānas, viz. Ādya, Sāmba, Kālikā, Nānda (v. l. Nandin), Āditya, Nārasiṁha, Viṣṇudharmottara (declared by Mārkaṇḍeya) and the śāstra called Viṣṇudharma (eight in all). He mentions that he drew upon all these for the production of his work on dānas, 1375 in number (verses 11-20

pp. 2–3). Then he mentions certain Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas which he discarded in his work on dānas for various reasons.

Some of these remarks are very important and the original verses are set out in the note below.[1405] He states that he did-not draw upon the Bhāgavata, the Brahmāṇḍa and the Nāradīya as dānas are absent therefrom. He did not rely in his work upon the Liṅgapurāṇa, though it is a large work, because its essence, he decides, is the same as the treatment of Mahādānas declared in the Matsyapurāṇa; the Bhaviṣyapurāṇa has been assiduously utilised by him only up to the (vratavidhis of) 7th tithi, but he discards the procedures of the 8th and 9th tithis (of the Bhaviṣyapurāṇa), since they are overwhelmed (tainted) with (the doctrines of)[1406] heretical sects (Tāntrikas,

---

1405. बृहदपि लिङ्गपुराणं मत्स्यपुराणोदितैर्महादानैः । अवधार्य तुल्यसारं दाननिबन्धेऽत्र न निबद्धम् ॥ 58 सप्तम्यैव पुराणं भविष्यमपि सङ्गृहीतमतियत्नात् । त्यक्त्वाष्टमीनवम्यौ कल्पौ पाषण्डिभिर्ग्रस्तौ ॥ लोकप्रसिद्धमेतद्विष्णुरहस्यं च शिवरहस्यं च । द्वयमिह न परिगृहीतं संग्रहरूपत्वमवधार्य ॥ भविष्योत्तरमाचारप्रसिद्धमविरोधि च । प्रामाण्यज्ञापकादृष्टेर्ग्रन्थादस्मात् पृथक् कृतम् ॥ प्रचरद्रूपतः स्कन्दपुराणैकांशतोधिकम् । यत्खण्डत्रितयं पौण्ड्रेवावल्लिकथाश्रयम् ॥ तार्क्ष्यं पुराणमपरं ब्राह्ममाग्नेयमेव च । त्रयोविंशतिसाहस्रं पुराणमपि वैष्णवम् ॥ षट्सहस्रमितं लैङ्गं पुराणमपरं तथा । दीक्षाप्रतिष्ठापाषण्डयुक्तिरत्नपरीक्षणैः ॥ मृषावंशानुचरितैः कोषव्याकरणादिभिः । असङ्गतकथाबन्धपरस्परविरोधतः ॥ तन्मीनकेतनादीनां भण्डपाषण्डलिङ्गिनाम् । लोकवञ्चनमालोक्य सर्वमेवावधीरितम् ॥ एतत्पुराणोपपुराणसंख्याबहिष्कृतं कश्मलकर्मयोगात् । पाषण्डशास्त्रानुमतं निरूप्य देवीपुराणं न निबद्धमत्र ॥ 67 p 7. The com. विष्णुचित्ती on विष्णुपुराण remarks that the विष्णुपुराण has six recensions viz. of 6000 verses, 8000, 9000, 10000, 22000, 24000, while the दानसागर speaks of a विष्णुपुराण of 23000 verses which it discards. मेधातिथि on मनु IV. 200 remarks that each āśrama has some peculiar signs of its own such as the girdle, deer skin, (palāśa) staff of a Vedic student, the householder has a bamboo stick, ear-rings &c., a forest hermit has tattered garments and matted hair while a sannyāsin wears kaṣāya (reddish) garment &c. Those who maintain themselves by wearing these peculiar signs though they do not belong to that order incur sin. परा. मा. I. 2 p. 386 explains लिङ्गिनः as पाशुपतादयः.

1406. Both the कल्पतरु on व्रत pp. 274–308 and हेमाद्रि on व्रत vol. I pp. 921–956 contain several vratas on the 9th tithi from Bhaviṣyapurāṇa in honour of Durgā (under various names such as Caṇḍikā, Nandā) which have a *śākta* flavour. For example, as regards the Ubhayanavamīvrata (Kalpataru on vrata pp. 274–282) it is provided that the eight-armed Durgā called Tryambikā is to be honoured with red flowers and the naivedya of buffalo flesh (p. 275). Similarly, as regards Nāmanavamī vrata (*ibid.* p. 283–288) provision is made for a naivedya of fish and flesh and in the Mahānavamī vrata pp. 296–298 a naivedya of pāyasa and flesh for Maṅgalā is provided. In the Nandānavamī Durgā is called Nandā and the mantra

(*Continued on next page*)

Bauddhas, &c.); both the Viṣṇurahasya and Śivarahasya, though well-known among people, have not been accepted in this work, since they are considered to be mere compilations; the Bhaviṣyottara (Purāṇa) which is followed in peoples' practices and is not in conflict (with orthodox views) has been excluded from this work, since no indications (evidence) of its authoritativeness could be found; the following are ignored in the Dānasāgara for reasons stated: three khaṇḍas, viz. those concerned with the tales of Pauṇḍra, Revā and Avanti of the Skanda apart from a part of it that is prevalent (among people), the Tārkṣya (i. e. Garuḍa) purāṇa, another Brahmapurāṇa, another Āgneya (i. e. Agnipurāṇa), a Viṣṇupurāṇa containing 23000 verses, another Liṅgapurāṇa containing six thousand verses; all these have been discarded for various reasons such as the procedure of dīkṣā (initiation of a disciple by a guru in a cult like the Tāntrika or Pāñcarātra or Pāśupata) or of the establishment of an image, heretical reasoning, testing of jewels, stories of the doings of (persons of) false genealogies, treating of such matters as dictionaries and grammar, containing incoherent tales and contradictions, because they lead to the misleading of people by the description of or reference to Love affairs, to those who are buffoons, or are heretics or make their livelihood by displaying some sign (such as matted hair); the Devīpurāṇa has not been utilized in this work, because it is not included in the enumeration of the number of Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas (in various works), because it contains delusive acts[1406a] and because it approves of heretic śāstras.

(*Continued from last page*)

is 'om Nandāyai namaḥ' (p. 304) and in the Mahānavamīvrata (on Āśvina-śukla 9) worship is commended (p. 308) with plenty of wine and flesh and with the heads of buffaloes, rams and goats. All these Navamīvratas provide a dinner to maidens which is a peculiarity of śākta worship. Tāntrik practices must have affected people in Northern India long before the 11th century as the Kalpataru mentions the Sun's mantra 'Khakholkāya namaḥ'; vide भविष्य I. 215. 1-6 for the basic mantra (Mūla-mantra) and its adjuncts, some of which are 'ओं विटिविटि शिरः, ओं ज्वालिने इति शिखा, ओं सहस्ररश्मये फट् कवचम्, ओं सर्वतेजोधिपतये फट् अस्त्रम् । ओं सहस्रकिरणोज्ज्वलाय फट् ऊर्ध्वबन्धः ।' (कल्प० on व्रत p. 199). It may be noted that the Agnipurāṇa (272. 3) speaks of the gift of the Viṣṇupurāṇa containing 23000 verses.

1406a. कश्मल means मूर्च्छा or मोह acc. to अमरकोश 'मूर्च्छा तु कश्मलं मोहोऽप्यवमर्दस्तु पीडनम्'. In the भगवद्गीता II. 2 we have 'कुतस्त्वा कश्मलमिदं विषमे समुपस्थितम्' where it should mean मोह. If we prefer the variant reading कल्मषं, then the meaning would be मलिन (dark) or मलीमस.

Some important conclussions can be drawn from the above mentioned remarks of Ballālasena in his Dānasāgara. Next to the Mitākṣarā, the Kṛtyakalpataru and Aparārka's commentary, the Dānasāgara is among the earliest extant nibandha works the dates of which are nearly certain.[1407] If does not mention the Mitākṣarā, nor Kṛtyakalpataru nor Aparārka. Mr. Bhabatosh Bhattāchārya is right in his contention that the words 'Kalpadrumo jaṅgamaḥ' in the 3rd opening verse have nothing to do with Kalpataru of Lakṣmīdhara and that Prof. Rangaswamy Aiyangar is wrong in thinking that the verse refers to the Kalpataru (vide Mr. Bhattāchārya's Introduction to Dānasāgara p. XVIII and note 1).

The principal points that emerge from Ballālasena's remarks on Purāṇas are that he included both Vāyu and Śiva among the principal Purāṇas (sometimes called Mahāpurāṇas), that there were two Purāṇas called Linga, Brāhma, Āgneya and Viṣṇu, that the four counterparts bearing these names were not treated as authoritative (one pseudo-Liṅgapurāṇa having 6000 verses and one Viṣṇu having also 23000 verses being unauthoritative), that he abhorred Tāntrik rites and therefore totally discarded the Devīpurāṇa and parts of Bhaviṣya, that he did not utilize three named sections of the Skanda, that he did not regard the Garuḍa as authoritative. It may be stated here that acc. to the (printed) Kūrma I. 1. 17-20 some Upapurāṇas such as Skanda, Vāmana, Brahmāṇḍa and Nāradīya bear the same names as the Mahāpurāṇas. Prof. Hazra relies upon a passage quoted from the Bhaviṣyapurāṇa[1408] by Kalpataru (Brahmacāri-

---

1407. The pedigree of बल्लालसेन gathered from अ सा. and दानसागर is: हेमन्तसेन (in सोमवंश) – his son विजयसेन – his son बल्लालसेन – his son लक्ष्मणसेन. The अद्भुतसागर was begun in śaka 1089 (1167 A. D.) and was finished by his son लक्ष्मणसेन (p. 4 अ. सा.). The दानसागर was composed by बल्लालसेन in śaka 1091 (1169 A. D.); vide Mr. B. Bhattachārya's Introduction to दानसागर pp. XXV–XXVI. He composed three more works before the दान-सागर viz. the व्रतसागर (mentioned on pp. 52 and 59 of the दानसागर), प्रतिष्ठा-सागर and आचारसागर (in verses 55-56 p. 6 of दानसागर). So बल्लालसेन's literary activity should be placed between 1155 to 1180 A.D. He mentions अनिरुद्धभट्ट, author of हारलता and पितृदयिता, as his *guru* to whom he shows great reverence for his learning, high character and attainments in the दानसागर (p. 2 verse 6) and states that he learnt the essence of all Purāṇas and *smṛtis from him (verse 7). Vide H. of Dh. vol. I. (1930) pp. 340–341* for Ballālasena.

1408. भविष्यपुराणे। अष्टादश पुराणानि रामस्य चरितं तथा। विष्णुधर्मादिशास्त्राणि शिवधर्माश्च भारत॥ कार्ष्णं च पञ्चमो वेदो यन्महाभारतं स्मृतम्। सौराश्च धर्मा राजेन्द्र मान-

(Continued on next page)

kāṇḍa p. 25) wherein it is said that the appellation Jaya is applied to 18 Purāṇas, Rāmāyaṇa, Viṣṇudharmādiśāstras, Śivadharma, Mahābhārata, Sauradharmas and Mānavadharmas (Manusmṛti?). I shall discuss the question of Viṣṇudharmapurāna later. But I have serious objections against the antiquity and authenticity of this passage. Being quoted in the Kalpataru it may be earlier than 1050 A. D. That is all. In order to glorify the 18 Purāṇas the meaning of Jaya is extended. Jaya is applied only to the Mahābhārata in the latter e. g. Udyogaparva 136. 18–19 and Svargārohaṇika 5. 49 and 51 quoted in note 1369 above. Hence this passage was inserted very late after all 18 Purāṇas had been composed i. e. after the 9th century A. D. Besides the plural 'Viṣṇudharmādiśāstrāṇi' shows that many works are meant and *not one*, i. e. the meaning is that all śāstras dealing with Viṣṇudharmas and the like. If a single work were meant, one expects 'Viṣṇudharmādiśāstram ca' and that would have not spoilt the metre. Besides, the Kalpataru itself indicates that this verse about 'Jaya' was cited by some authorities as 'Smṛti'. Therefore, it is doubtful if it is a genuine Bhaviṣya passage. Ballālasena mentions only eight Upapurāṇas on dānas by name (including the four mentioned by the Matsya).

In spite of the very admirable and praiseworthy efforts of Dr. Hazra in the matter of the place of the Upapurāṇas, their contents, the search among numerous mss. to find out what the text of the several upapurāṇas has been, the present writer must say here once for all that he does not at all agree with most of the dates that he assign to the Sāmba, the Viṣṇudharma, the Viṣṇudharmottara, the Narasiṁhapurāṇa, which are the principal Upapurāṇas he has dealt with in the first volume of 'Studies in Upapurāṇas'. His dates for the four Upapurāṇas are;

(Continued from last page)

चोक्ता महीपते। जयेति नाम चैतेषां प्रवदन्ति मनीषिणः। यवत्र श्लोके 'स्मृतिः' इति कृत्वा म (मा?) माणिकानां वचनं (लिखनं in कृ. र.) तदपि महाजनपरिगृहीतत्वेन प्रमाणत्वात्। तथा 'स्मृत्यन्तरेषु च' इत्येनेनैव सङ्गृहीतं वेदितव्यम्। कल्पतरु (ब्रह्मचारि° *p. 25–26*). *The* कृत्यरत्नाकर reads 'तदविज्ञायमानवक्तृकमपि' before महाजन° and thereby clearly shows that the propounder of this passage (cited as from Bhaviṣya) was unknown, acc. to the कृत्यरत्नाकर and also कल्पतरु, but, as some authorities had accepted it, it was regarded as प्रमाण and even if cited as smṛti it would be included in the words 'अष्टादशपुराणेषु यानि वाक्यानि पुत्रक। तान्यालोच्य महाबाहो तथा स्मृत्यन्तरेषु च॥' occurring as a quotation from भविष्य on p. 24 (of ब्रह्मचारिकाण्ड). *The above verses are quoted by* कृ. र. *p.* 30.

Sāmba between 500 and 800 A. D. (p. 91), the Viṣṇudharma-purāṇa between 200–300 A. D. (p. 143), the Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa between 400 to 500 A. D. (p. 212) and the present Narasiṁha-purāṇa between 400 to 500 A. D. To examine all his reasons the present writer would have to write another book. Therefore, he proposes to give only a few illustrations of the way in which Dr. Hazra arrives at his dates. But before this is done it is better to mention some of his own findings on the Purāṇas and the four Upapurāṇas mentioned above. On p. 27 he observes that the text of the extant Mahāpurāṇas which are the results of innumerable changes, modifications and interpolations made at different times and by different sects is *scarcely reliable* and can be used with great caution and careful discrimination. I agree with him. But the same or perhaps worse is the case with the Upapurāṇas. Prof. Hazra himself says ('Studies' vol. I. p. 23) that after the group of 18 principal Purāṇas had been compiled many sub-systems and sects like the Śāktas and Sauras came into prominence and their adherents interpolated chapters in the 18 established Purāṇas and wrote new and independent works styled Purāṇas in order to propagate their own ideas and that some of these latter came to be called Upapurāṇas. The result is that, unless we have critical editions of the Purāṇas and the principal Upapurāṇas on the model of the critical edition of the Mahābhārata at the BORI in Poona, all chapters and often single verses are suspect. But the task of preparing critical editions of even the principal Purāṇas and some of the Upapurāṇas based upon ancient and medieval mss. collected from all parts of India would be far more colossal and costly than even the critical edition of the Mahābhārata. Therefore, most chronological conclusions about the dates of Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas and about the borrowings of one Purāṇa from another are just tentative at the most and likely to be set aside by new evidence as long as critical editions of Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas are not available.

Let us now turn to the four Upapurāṇas dealt with at length by Prof. Hazra. About the Sāmba (which is one of the four Upapurāṇas expressly named in the Matsyapurāṇa 53. 60–63) Prof. Hazra observes ('Studies' vol. I. p. 68) that the present Sāmba-purāṇa consists of different units mostly belonging to different countries and ages and after analysing in his own way the several chapters of the Sāmba he arrives at the conclusion (on p. 93) that chapters 17, 22 and 23 of the printed

edition were added later than 950 A. D., that chap. 44–45 were inserted between 950 and 1050 A. D. and chap. 39–43 and 47–83 were added between 1250 and 1500 A. D. There is at present only one printed ed. of the Sāmba viz. that of the Veṅk. Press in 84 chapters based probably only on one ms. Out of these 84 chapters Prof. Hazra himself finds that 47 chapters are later than 950 A. D., of which 42 were added between 1250-1500 A. D. Prof. Hazra has himself examined several mss of the Sāmba, but they do not come from all over India, many being from Bengal and almost all seem to be late ones (p. 33 last line), being copied in śaka 1764 i. e. 1842 A. D. When more than half of this Purāṇa ranges between 950 to 1500 A. D. according to Prof. Hazra, how can it be usefully employed for chronological purposes? Nobody can say when the verses about the four Upapurāṇas were inserted in the Matsya, but one can affirm that it was done about the 9th century A. D. or even later. Two dates about Upapurāṇas are certain, viz. that Sāmba is mentioned by Alberuni (Sachau, I. p. 130) who wrote in 1030 A. D. and that the Dānasāgara (verses 13–15 on p. 3), composed in 1069 A.D. mentions eight Upapurāṇas on dānas of which four viz. Sāmba, Nārasiṁha, Nandi and Āditya are the same as are mentioned in the Matsya. Therefore, an Upapurāṇa called Sāmba must have been composed a century or two earlier than 1000 A. D. On p. 91 he holds that the Sāmba cannot be dated later than 800 A. D. It is difficult to fall in line with all the assumptions on pp. 90–91 for arriving at this date. What the Sāmba named by Matsya contained beyond the words 'story of Sāmba' is not at all known. Prof. Hazra himself has given up at least half of the printed Sāmba as later than 950 A. D. and there is absolutely no reliable evidence to hold that the remaining portion of the Sāmba is earlier than 800 A. D. or even earlier than 950 A. D.

The next Upapurāṇa is Viṣṇudharma dealt with by Prof. Hazra in 'Studies' vol. I. pp. 118–155. There is no printed edition. Prof. Hazra (p. 119) refers to six mss. but he has chiefly used *only one* ms. viz. Bengal Asiatic Society's ms. No. 1670. This Purāṇa has 105 chapters and over 4000 verses. Prof. Hazra admits (p. 119) that it has very little of the principal characteristics of a Purāṇa and deals exclusively with the religious rites and duties of Vaiṣṇavas. Alberuni names Viṣṇudharma but the verses that he quotes therefrom are found in the Viṣṇudharmottara as Bühler pointed out long ago (I. A. vol. XIX. pp. 381–410 and vide table given by Prof. Hazra on p. 208 comparing the two). Prof. Hazra holds (p. 116) relying on two verses quot-

ed below from Viṣṇudharmottara[1408a] that the Viṣṇudharmottara is only the latter part of Viṣṇudharma and that, as he holds that the former was composed between 400–500 A. D., the date of the Viṣṇudharma falls between 200 and 300 A. D. (p. 143). The other arguments that he advances are practically worthless. In the present author's opinion those verses can be interpreted in two other but different ways, viz. that the first section of the present Viṣṇudharmottara is called Viṣṇudharma or that the Viṣṇudharmottara is so called because it was composed after the Viṣṇupurāṇa, which contains the greatness of Viṣṇu and the dharmas of Vaiṣṇavas. He often trots out the theory that, if a work is free from Tantric elements, it must be an early work belonging to the 3rd or 4th century A.D. (see p. 142). The Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha of Mādhavācārya (which was composed in the 14th century) makes no reference to the cult of Śakti or the system of Tantra, though it devotes a good deal of space to the views of even Cārvāka (a thorough-going atheist), Bauddhas and Jainas. The Sarvasiddhāntasaṅgraha also does not refer to the Śāktas or the Tantras. But no one can argue that Mādhava is earlier than 4th or 5th century A.D. There may be various reasons for silence. One may abhor a thing and may not refer to it or use it at all as the Dānasāgara says about the Devīpurāṇa. The argument from silence is a slippery one. I challenge the whole basis of Prof. Hazra's date for Viṣṇudharma, viz. the date of the Viṣṇudharmottara. This last is a vast work in three sections. It would be proved later that portions of the latter Purāṇa dealing

---

1408 a. अधीते सोत्तरं यश्च विष्णुधर्ममिमं शुभम्। विष्णुधर्मोत्तर I.143.16 ; संसारक्षयहेत्वर्थे भावोपकरणेषु च। सोत्तरा वैष्णवा धर्माः सारमेतत्प्रकीर्तितम्॥ विष्णुधर्मोत्तर I. 74. 35. These verses are not clear enough for holding that the present विष्णुधर्मोत्तर is only the latter part of another work called विष्णुधर्मं. That verse uses the word इमं which refers to the first section of the present विष्णुधर्मोत्तर and refers only to one who studies the first section and also the following sections. The word इमं cannot be proved to refer to विष्णुधर्मशास्त्र, which is nowhere expressly mentioned as a पुराण in the विष्णुधर्मोत्तर. To take इमं as referring to विष्णुधर्मं, a separate work, would be equal to assuming what has to be proved. Alberuni mentions Viṣṇudharma as a short form of विष्णुधर्मोत्तर and nothing more. Similarly, in the 2nd passage it is expressly stated that in the first section the essence of Vaiṣṇava duties is given along with the following two sections. The Matsya (53. 16) speaks of the Viṣṇupurāṇa as one in which Parāśara proclaimed all the dharmas with reference to Vārāhakalpa; वाराहकल्पवृत्तान्तमधिकृत्य पराशरः। यत्प्राह धर्मानखिलांस्तद्युक्तं वैष्णवं विदुः॥ मत्स्य 53.16 The word धर्मान् is used in the मत्स्य with reference to four Purāṇas, Vāyu, Viṣṇu, Nāradīya and Skanda, out of 18. The Viṣṇu is full of the characteristic qualities of Vaiṣṇavas e. g. vide III. 7. 20–33, III. 8. 9–19 &c.

with prognostications from dreams cannot be placed earlier than about 600 to 650 A. D. For the Viṣṇudharma we have to rely on what Prof. Hazra quotes. Chap. 66 quotes the famous words of the Gītā 'whenever there is decline of dharma &c.' (p. 143 n. 94) and then the same chap. mentions the incarnations of Viṣṇu including Buddha (p. 125). Therefore, the mention of the ten avatāras in the context of the words of the Gītā is natural and should not be regarded as spurious simply because it comes in the way of one's pet theories. On p. 144 he quotes ten verses from chapter 66 in which Buddha is described as son of Śuddhodana and his doctrines are stated. Prof. Hazra (on pp 145–146) gives four reasons which are quite unconvincing. The Purāṇas mention the avatāras of Viṣṇu in several places. The Bhāgavata in I. 3 names 22 avatāras. On p. 150 Prof. Hazra himself quotes a long passage about the evils of the Kali age from the Viṣṇudharma in which occurs a significant half verse 'utkocāḥ saugatāś-caiva Mahāyānaratās-tathā'. Here not only are the followers of Buddha mentioned but also those who are of the Mahāyāna persuasion. On p. 124 Prof. Hazra states that the Viṣṇudharma (p. 124 n. 45) mentions by name 33 authors of Dharmaśāstras, besides the Saptarṣis and others. Yāj. (I. 4–5) mentions only 19 promulgators of Dharmaśāstra (including himself and holding Śaṅkha-likhita as one). Both the Viṣṇudharma and the Viṣṇudharmottara are not mentioned by the Matsya. Therefore, it must be held that they were not recognized as Upapurāṇas at the time when the verses about Upapurāṇas were interpolated in the Matsya and were not so recognized till at least the 8th or 9th century A. D. The Viṣṇudharma is opposed to what is stated by all writers from the Gṛhya and Dharmasūtras, by Manu (III. 128–186), by Matsya, Kūrma and other Purāṇas about the qualifications of the brāhmaṇas to be invited at a śrāddha dinner (vide H. of Dh. vol. IV pp. 384–387). It expressly says that squint-eyed, hunch-backed, impotent, poor and diseased brāhmaṇas should be mixed up at a śrāddha along with those who are deeply versed in the Veda.[1409] This does not bespeak an early date. On p. 138 Prof. Hazra refers to several nibandhakāras as quoting from Viṣṇudharma such as Gadādhara up to Ballālasena, Aparārka and Kṛtyakalpataru. These do not carry the date beyond 1000 A. D. and besides an examination of quotations in only one work (Aparārka) will show that the

---

1409. काणाः कुब्जाश्च षण्ढाश्च दरिद्रा व्याधितास्तथा। सर्वे श्राद्धे नियोक्तव्या मिश्रिता वेदपारगैः॥ (Hazra p. 153 n 117).

Viṣṇudharma was an hotch-potch bringing together passages from several sources (vide note).[1410] Prof. Hazra himself holds that the original Viṣṇudharma was appropriated and recast by Bhāgavatas and that many verses quoted from Viṣṇudharma by Raghunandana, Govindānanda and the Madanapārijāta do not occur in the present work (pp. 154-155).

Then we come to the Viṣṇudharmottara. The only printed edition is that of the Veṅk. Press. It is a vast work divided into three sections. The first deals with geography, solar and lunar dynasties, astronomy and astrology, gotra and pravara, śrāddhas, Manvantaras, Bharata's fight with Gandharvas and Śatrughna's with Lavaṇa. The 2nd section deals with various aspects of Rājadharma and the third section of the Purāṇa deals with Citrasūtravidhāna and contains several topics such as painting, dancing, music, song, rasas, riddles, dramaturgy, metrics, figures of speech, construction of images, building of temples, symptoms of approaching death, gifts of various kinds, law and justice, hermits and sannyāsins. On p. 212 Dr. Hazra places this Purāṇa between 400-500 A. D. Reasons of limitations of space preclude any detailed criticism of Prof. Hazra's treatment. In III. 351.54 Buddha is mentioned as an avatāra which Prof. Hazra says is 'most probably spurious' (p. 212) and advances no reasons for this summary judgment. He puts in his usual argument of its non-Tantric[1411] character and frequent use of the word prādurbhāva

---

1410. अपरार्क on pp. 368-370 quotes about 20 verses from विष्णुधर्म, some of which may be examined here : षष्टिं वर्षसहस्राणि स्वर्गे वसति भूमिदः । आच्छेत्ता चानुमन्ता च तान्येव नरके वसेत् ॥. This very verse is q. by अपरार्क on p. 370 from आदित्यपुराण. This verse is stated to be derived from व्यास and मनु in E. I. vol. 12 p. 135. The गृहस्थरत्नाकर p. 517 quotes it from बृहस्पति, while बृहस्पतिस्मृति (Ānan. collection) verse 29 has the latter half of it. On p. 369 the verse यत्किञ्चित्कुरुते पापं is quoted from विष्णुधर्म but the same is quoted by अपरार्क himself on p. 370 from मत्स्य and it is verse 7 of बृहस्पतिस्मृति and is also अनुशासन 62. 19 and वासिष्ठधर्मसूत्र 29. 16. Then at the end of that long passage is verse आस्फोटयन्ति पितरः (अपरार्क p. 370), which is बृहस्पतिस्मृति 17 and पद्मपुराण VI. 33. 17.

1411. I fail to understand what Prof. Hazra definitely means by non-Tantrik character. He admits (on p 218) that *bījas* and *kavacas* are found in Viṣṇudharmottara of which section I. chap. 226 names over 100 मातृs, some of whose names are काली, महाकाली, अपराजिता, कालदूती, दुर्भगा, कराला, कपाली, पिशाची &c.; chap. 237 of विष्णुधर्मोत्तर (verse 20) refers to वैष्णवकवच and at the end we have purely Tāntrik formulas, some of which quoted as specimens are : ' ओं सुकारे मकरोत्कट विकट-

(Continued on next page)

and not 'avatāra' which latter, he says, occurs in two places only. Prof. Hazra often attaches undue importance to insignificant details. Whether the word 'prādurbhāva' is used or 'avatāra' is used matters little. The same Purāṇa uses both words promiscuously e. g. *Narasiṁha* (*36. 1*, 'avatārānahaṁ vakṣye') begins with the word 'avatāra' and in *39. 1* employs the word 'prādurbhāva' (ataḥ param Hareḥ puṇyam prādurbhāvam) and in the colophons of all chapters from 36 to 53 the word 'prādurbhāva' is used. The Matsya 247. 1 starts with 'prādurbhāvān purāṇeṣu Viṣṇoramitatejasaḥ'. In 247. 19–21 the Matsya employs the word 'avatīrṇaḥ' with regard to Vāmana and Nṛsiṁha and in 246. 4 'avatīrṇo jagadyoniḥ······Vāmaneneha rūpeṇa &c.'. *Padma* V. *13. 182* speaks of twelve avatāras; Viṣṇu V. 16 also uses the word 'avatāra'. On p. 199 he gives a table of passages that are common to Manu, Yāj., Nārada and Viṣṇudharmottara, on p. 200 another table of passages common to Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra and Viṣṇudharmottara, and on page 202 a table of passages common to Matsya and Viṣṇudharmottara and holds that the Matsya borrows. This is a most astounding proposition. The Matsya does not even mention the Viṣṇudharmottara as an Upapurāṇa; the only sure and earliest date is that the latter is mentioned by Alberuni. That does not carry the matter beyond 900–1000 A. D. The Matsyapurāṇa might have been tampered with. The reasons assigned for his opinion by Prof. Hazra are, to say the least, flimsy and unconvincing. It is further to be noted that there are twelve verses that state that some phenomena are not to be held to be utpātas, that are common to Matsya 229. 14–25, Viṣṇudharmottara (II. 134. 15–26) and the Bṛhatsaṁhitā (*45. 83–94*), which are quoted by the Adbhutasāgara pp. 743–744 as occurring in all these three and in Bārhaspatya. I have dealt with this matter above on p. 768 n 1240. Varāha states that these

---

(Continued from last page)

वज्र पूर्वतो रक्ष । ओं हें है है हैं दिनकरसहस्रकान्तसमोद्यतेज पश्चिमतो रक्ष रक्ष । ओं निरिनिरि प्रदीप्तज्वलनज्वालाकालमहाकपिलजटिल उत्तरतो रक्ष । ओं चिलिचिलि मिलिमिलि चेकवि गौरि गान्धारि विषोद्दनि विषं मोहयतु स्वाहा दक्षिणतो रक्ष ।'. If this is not tantricism I should like to know what it is. In विष्णुधर्मोत्तर II. 165 there is great eulogy of the Gāyatrī (or Sāvitrī) mantra. Therein verses 55 ff of the same Purāṇa prescribe how Gāyatrī can be used against one's bad enemy. A few verses are quoted: अभिचारेषु तां देवीं विपरीतां प्रयोजयेत् । कार्या व्याहृतयश्चात्र विपरीताक्षरास्तथा । विपरीताक्षरं कार्यं शिरश्च मनुजेश्वर । आदौ शिरः प्रयोक्तव्यं प्रणवान्ते च यादव । स्वाहास्थाने च फट्कारं साध्यनामसमन्वितम् । ···अभिचारे च होतव्या राजिका विषमिश्रिताः । स्वरक्तमिश्रं होतव्यं कटुतैलमथापि वा । ···महापराधं बलिनं देवब्राह्मणकण्टकम् । अभिचारेण यो हन्यान्न स दोषेण लिप्यते ।' 65.

verses are the summaries (ṛṣiputrakṛtaih ślokair-vidyād-etat *samāsoktaiḥ*) of the ślokas of Ṛṣiputra. Therefore, the view that they are borrowed by Varāha from the Matsya or Viṣṇudharmottara would be out of question. The two Purāṇas do not say whence they have taken them. Therefore, it would not be unjustifiable to hold that in both Purāṇas the verses of the Bṛhat-saṁhitā were inserted. There is another circumstance that strengthens this last view. The Adbhutasāgara on pp. 493-494 quotes seven verses from the Bṛhad-yātrā of Varāha alone. These verses are quoted by Utpala on Bṛ. S. 47. 22 (where Varāha says 'sadasat-svapnanimittam yātrāyām svapnavidhir-uktaḥ) from 'Yātrā'. These verses (8 in all) are Varāha's own (as he says) and not taken from any other source. Three of these verses on dreams occur in the Viṣṇudharmottara (II. 176. 9-11). They are quoted above on p. 776 note 1254. Prof. Hazra does not appear to have carefully gone into the several works of Varāhamihira and is not right when he says (on pp. 201 and 211) that 'the Viṣṇudharmottara does not refer to or utilize the works of Varāhamihira'. The Viṣṇudharmottara is an encyclopaedia, while Varāhamihira was a great astronomer and astrologer. He would turn to his predecessors in his own subject if he wanted to borrow and he expressly mentions numerous predecessors (vide pp. 591-594 above) and not to an Upapurāṇa (which in my view did not exist or at least was not recognised as an authority when Varāha wrote in the first half of the 6th century A. D.) Besides, the presumption to be drawn from the nature of the Upapurāṇa is in favour of holding that it borrows.

Prof. Hazra deals with the Narasiṁha-purāṇa on pp. 219-266 of his 'Studies' vol. I. The only printed edition is that published in 1911 by Gopal Narayan and Co. (Bombay) in 68 chapters based on three mss. about which no information is given. This Purāṇa appears to have been composed solely for the glorification of Narasiṁha identified with Nārāyaṇa. Prof. Hazra has used several mss., two, the oldest, being dated in śaka 1567 (i.e. 1645 A. D.), some of the others are not dated and a few are dated so late as 1798 A. D. and 1810 A. D.; and some are written in Bengali script. On p. 322 Prof. Hazra says about one ms. in Eggeling's cat. of India Office mss. that it was copied about 1500-1600 A.D. and its last five folios were supplied in 1789 A. D. No reasons are given why this ms. should be regarded as being copied between 1500-1600. This is probably a guess, so all the mss. consulted are not earlier than the 17th and following centuries. Most mss. do not

agree with the printed edition in the number of chapters and also lack certain chapters of the printed edition. Prof. Hazra holds (p. 242) on various grounds, all of which cannot be examined here, that the '*present* Narasiṁhapurāṇa is to be placed between 400–500 A. D.' One or two of his characteristic arguments will be noticed here. In chap. 36. 9 (kalau prāpte yathā Buddho bhaven-Nārāyaṇaḥ prabhuḥ) Buddha is mentioned; Mārkaṇḍeya promises in chap. 36 to narrate stories about eleven avatāras (among whom Balarāma, Kṛṣṇa and Buddha are included) and in chapters 37–54, the stories of all avatāras except Buddha are given and it is added[1412] in chap. 54 that 'I have spoken of the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu. The devotee of Nṛsiṁha who always listens to these attains Viṣṇu'. It may be noted that Balabhadra is mentioned in a half verse (36. 8) which is found only in ms. 'ga' of the three mss. of the printed edition. In chap. 53 a few exploits of Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa are narrated in the same chapter and so the half line was inserted later. As the story of Buddha is not given Prof. Hazra holds that the verse in 36. 9 is undoubtedly spurious (pp. 230 and 249). It never occurred to Prof. Hazra that the sectarian zeal of a bigoted Vaiṣṇava might have never cared to give the life of Buddha who was not concerned with (but was antagonistic to) the varṇa system and the Vedas or might have omitted the story of the life of Buddha even if it occurred in the ms. from which he copied. The present author thinks that 36.9 is a genuine verse and enumerates Buddha as an avatāra following the universal belief held in India at least from the 9th or 10th century A. D. that Buddha was an avatāra, but probably bigotry led to the omission of the details of Buddha's life. Besides, the verse is capable of another interpretation. It is only the stories of ten avatāras (excluding Buddha) that lead a devotee to Viṣṇu. A devotee may worship any one of Nṛsiṁha, Rāma or Kṛṣṇa, and reach Viṣṇu, but hardly any orthodox work has ever stated that worship of Buddha alone (an avatāra) will lead to attainment of Viṣṇu. Therefore, it is proper to hold that the story of Buddha's life might not have been given at all or was purposely omitted. On p. 239 Prof. Hazra puts forward a peculiar argument. According to the Narasiṁha-purāṇa chap. 53. 31, says Prof. Hazra, Kṛṣṇa embodies only a part of Viṣṇu's śakti[1413] and therefore 'the Narasiṁha is to be dated

---

1412. दशावतारा: कथितास्तवैव हरेर्मया पार्थिव पापहन्तुः । इमं सदा यस्तु नृसिंहभक्तः शृणोति नित्यं स तु याति विष्णुम् । नरसिंहपु० 54. 6.

1413. सितकृष्णे च मच्छक्ती कंसादीन् घातयिष्यतः । ...तयोः सिता च रोहिण्यां वसुदेवाद्बभूव ह ॥ तद्वत्कृष्णा च देवक्यां वसुदेवाद्बभूव ह ॥ नरसिंहपु० 53. 31, 33-34.

earlier than the present Bhāgavata in which Kṛṣṇa is called *bhagavān* himself (Bhāgavata I. 3. 28). As the present Bhāgavata is to be dated in the 6th century A. D. the Narasiṁha is to be placed not later than 500 A D.' Great controversies have raged over the date of the Bhāgavata. The present author holds that the Bhāgavata-purāṇa does not belong to the 6th century A. D. It will be shown below that while Rāmānuja quotes more than a hundred verses from the Viṣṇupurāṇa, which he regarded as one of supreme authority over other Purāṇas (in Vedārthasaṅgraha pp. 141–142 of D. C. edition) he does not quote the Bhāgavata at all in his bhāṣya on the Vedāntasūtra. A bigoted devotee of Narasiṁha may say that Narasiṁha avatāra is the perfect avatāra of Viṣṇu, while Kṛṣṇa is only a partial one. But surely that cannot determine the dates of the respective purāṇas. What bigoted devotees are capable of saying may be seen from Brahmāṇḍa III. 36. 18–20 quoted later in this section, where it is asserted that the reward of repeating thrice the thousand names of Viṣṇu is yielded by repeating one name of Kṛṣṇa once. The strongest argument against the authenticity and early date of the present Narasiṁhapurāṇa has not been properly and adequately emphasized or appreciated by Prof. Hazra. The Matsya (53. 60–63) gives meagre details about the four Upapurāṇas expressly named by it, but about the Narasiṁha it makes one definite statement that it contained 18000 verses (53. 60). The present Narasiṁha contains only about 3400 verses.[1414] Therefore, the old Narasiṁhapurāṇa exists no more and in its place a new one has been substituted, probably containing some of the topics and chapters contained in the old one. We do not know the extent of the Narasiṁha mentioned by Alberuni. For ought we know he might have referred to the old extensive purāṇa or the new stripling substituted in its place. Even some of the mss. copied in comparatively recent times drop several chapters of the printed purāṇa; on p. 249 Prof. Hazra holds that chapters 34 verses 43–55, and chapters 61, 65 (on 68 holy places for Vaiṣṇavas), 66, 67 are genuine parts, though dropped in

---

1414. Even a late writer like नरसिंहवाजपेयिन् patronized by the Gajapati king Mukundadeva (1559–1568 A. D.) says in his नित्याचारप्रदीप (B. I, ed.) vol. I. p. 18 'प्रसिद्धनारसिंहस्य अष्टादशसाहस्रसंख्या यद्यपि नोपलभ्यते किञ्चित् कालक्रमाल्लुप्तमिति प्रतिभाति।'. *It further says that the Nandi or Nanda purāṇa* is a part of Skanda and that, since Lakṣmīdhara says that the Kālikā is an Upapurāṇa, those that say that by the word Bhāgavata the Kālikā is meant are wrong and then enumerates the 18 उपपुराणs.

some mss. Prof. Hazra's judgments on various matters are most liable to be challenged; but considerations of space prevent any detailed treatment. On p. 252 he holds that in chap. 6 the story of the birth of Vasiṣṭha and Agastya as the sons of Mitra and Varuṇa, the story of Yama and Yamī are comparatively late additions. The story of the birth of Vasistha from Urvaśī and Mitra and Varuṇa is alluded to even in the Ṛgveda (VII. 33. 11) and in the previous verse (10) of the same hymn Vasiṣṭha, Agastya and Mitrāvarunau are brought together. The story of Yama and Yamī occurs in Ṛg. X. 10. The Narasiṁha itself states (in chap. 14 1) that the story of Yama and Yamī is Vaidikī. The Purāna may have added some fringes and embellishments, but the main theme is the same in both. On p. 254-255 and note 330 Prof. Hazra was constrained to admit that the Narasiṁha-purāṇa had been revised more than once, remarks that Hemādri had a more extensive purāna before him than the printed one and that a comparison of the verses quoted from the Narasimha-purāṇa by the Madanapārijāta pp. 301-302, Smṛtitattva on āhnika (vol. I. p. 411) and Nityācārapradīpa (vol. I p. 617) show that the text of the Narasiṁha used by Raghunandana and Narasimha-vājapeyin agrees more with the printed text than the text used by Madanapāla (about 1375 A. D.), less than 200 years before Raghunandana.

The extant Narasiṁhapurāṇa is an insignificant one as compared with the principal Purāṇas like Vāyu, Matsya, Viṣṇu; the Sāmba is not quoted at all by Aparārka, the Viṣṇudharma only twice and even the Visṇudharmottara is quoted by Aparārka only 7 times for about 25 verses in all. The very extensive digest Kalpataru (first half of 12th century A. D.) contains hardly any quotation from Viṣṇudharmottara on vratas (though the latter devotes about 1600 verses to vratas), nor is it quoted in the sections on brahmacāri and other kāṇḍas, while hundreds of verses are quoted from Matsya, Brahma, Bhaviṣyā, Mārkaṇḍeya and other Purāṇas. Aparārka in his huge digest of 1252 printed pages quotes the Narasiṁhapurāṇa only 9 times and in all about 30 verses only, of which about half are in respect of *sannyāsa*, while the Brahmapurāṇa is quoted 68 times for hundreds of verses, the Matsya is quoted over 50 times for several hundred verses. The Tulasī plant is now sacred to the devotees of Viṣṇu, but it does not figure in early Paurāṇika or other literature. It is mentioned in chapters

31. 87 (in a prose passage) and 34 (19 and 23) of the printed Narasiṁhapurāṇa. As usual Prof. Hazra holds these references are due to later revisions and should not be held to suggest a late date for the extant Narasiṁhapurāṇa (p. 255). Tulasī-māhātmya is very much in evidence in the Padma e. g. in IV. 94. 4–10, V. 58. 109ff and V. 59, VI. 24. 2–43. The very late part of Padma VI (chap. 98–107) contains the story of Jālandhara, whose wife Vṛndā is said to have become Tulasī. Prof. Hazra fails to realize the full force of his own admission that the Narasiṁha was revised several times and that writers of the 16th century had a version before them different from that before the writers of the 13th or 14th century. In the author's opinion the whole Purāṇa becomes suspect and that by mere diplomatic criticism one would not be able to support beyond doubt any chronological conclusion derived from the present truncated and garbled version of the original Narasiṁha.

So much space had to be devoted to an examination of Prof. Hazra's work on the Upapurāṇas for cogent reasons. His is the latest and most elaborate treatment of Purāṇas and particularly of Upapurāṇas, on which he has bestowed immense labour. His opinions, particularly about the dates of the Upapurāṇas, are likely to be taken as the last word on the subject and even his unfounded surmises are likely to be taken as well-established conclusions. Modern Sanskrit scholars have sad experience about such matters. Max Muller, working back from the date of Buddha and assigning arbitrarily two hundred years each for three periods viz. the Upaniṣad period, the Brāhmaṇa period and the Saṁhitā period, inferred that the composition of the Vedas was to be assigned to a period about 1200 B. C. He no doubt said that his periods were the minimum and that his was a pure surmise. Yet most writers who have not themselves made a deep study of the Veda assign the Vedas to about 1200 to 1400 B. C. even after the lapse of about one hundred years from the time when Max Muller launched his surmises. For example, Prof. Toynbee in the table of the time spans of the growth phases of civilizations on p. 758 of volume IX (1954) gives the dates of Epiphany and of breakdown of the Indic civilization as 1375 B. C. and 725 B. C. respectively. The present author does not at all agree with the dates assigned to the Upapurāṇas by Prof. Hazra and with the methods and reasoning adopted for arriving at those dates. He had to perform this painful duty even in spite of his regard for Prof. Hazra.

There are numerous works, translations and papers on Purāṇas. A few alone are mentioned here. Eugene Burnouf translated the Bhāgavata Purāṇa in French in five volumes in 1840 and later years. The translations of Viṣṇu and Mārkaṇḍeya were made respectively by H. H. Wilson and Pargiter; Prof. Kirfel's Introduction to 'Purāṇa pañcalakṣaṇa' (1927, Bonn) was translated in the Journal of the Shri Veṅkaṭeśa Institute, vol. VII pp. 81-121 and vol. VIII. pp. 9-33; Kirfel in Festschrift Jacobi pp. 298-316; K. P. Jayaswal on 'Chronological tables in Puranic chronicles' in J. B. O. R. S. vol. III pp. 246-262; 'Purāṇas and Indus Aryas' and 'Study of ancient Geography in Agnipurāṇa' in I. H. Q. (1933), vol. 18 pp. 461 and 470; Prof. Ramchandra Dikshitar's studies on Vāyu and Matsya and Index to (five) Purāṇas in three volumes; J. R. A. S. 1941 pp. 247-256 and pp. 337-350 by W. Ruben for 'Puranic line of heroes'; J. A. S. B. for 1938, vol. IV. Article 15 pp. 393 ff; 'Purāṇas on Guptas' in I. H. Q. vol. 21 pp. 141 ff and 'Gupta Inscriptions and Purāṇas' by Dr. D. R. Patil in B.D.C.R.I. vol. II. pp. 148-165; H. C Raychaudhuri in a paper in the Pro. of the 10th Oriental Conference, pp. 390 ff for discrepancies of Puranic accounts with epigraphic records; paper by Mr. B. C. Majmudar on 'Origin and character of Purāṇa literature' in Sir Asutosh Mukharji Silver Jubilee vol. III, Orientalia, part 2 pp. 9-30; a verse from p. 30 of 'Inscriptiones Sanskrites de Champa et du Cambodge' refers to the provision made by a king of the 6th century A. D. for the daily reading of the Bhārata, Rāmāyaṇa and Purāṇas;[1414a] the Penukonda plates of the early Gaṅga king Mādhava II, (E. I. vol. 14 p. 338) speaks of him as knowing 'the essence of many śāstras, Itihāsa and Purāṇas' (probably in 6th century A. D.); Purāṇas are mentioned as studied in 578 A. D. (in E. I. vol. 28 p. 59).

In the following notes on individual Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas the author adds a few notes based on his own study of the Purāṇas and (printed) digests (*nibandhas*) of an early age. He desires to emphasize that the earliest works that can be called digests and are available in print cannot be placed earlier than about 1100 A. D. Though there is difference of views among scholars about the exact dates of composition, the Mitākṣarā, the Kṛtyakalpataru (which is a regular Digest of various kinds of materials on Dharmaśāstra) and Aparārka's work (though in

---

1414 a The verse is रामायणपुराणाभ्यामशेषं भारतं ददत्। अक्लृप्तान्वहमच्छेद्यां स च तद्वाचनस्थितिम्॥, vide I. H. Q. vol. 22 pp. 221-223.

form a commentary on Yājñavalkya-smṛti is still in the nature of a Digest) are three printed works more or less contemporary and composed between about 1100 to 1140 A. D. The Kṛtyakalpataru on Vyavahāra mentions by name Prakāśa, Halāyudha, Kāmadhenu and Pārijāta. Besides, Kṛityakalpataru (Niyata p. 280) cites the explanation of Parārīka (in Āp. Dh. S. I. 17. 26) by the Smṛtimañjarī (of Govindarāja) and also on śrāddha (pp. 46 and 259). It has been shown in H. of Dh. vol. I. that Prakāśa (pp. 306–308), Pārijāta (pp. 308–309), Smrtimañjarī (pp. 312–314) were works of the digest *genre.* The Kāmadhenu of Gopāla also appears to have been a digest (H. of Dh. vol. I. pp. 293 ff.). The author Gopāla was a friend of Laksmīdhara (vide Introd. to Dānakāṇḍa p. 49), but, since the latter employs the past tense (*cakre*) with reference to Gopāla's work and the present tense (*tanyate kalpavṛkṣaḥ*) as regards his own work it follows that the Kāmadhenu was composed at least a few years before the Kalpataru. As no mss. of the Prakāsa, Pārijāta and Kāmadhenu are available it is impossible to say anything about their exhaustiveness or otherwise. But from the summary at the end of the ms. on the Prāyaścitta section of the Smṛtimañjarī (H. of Dh. vol. I. p. 312 note 714) it appears that it must have been fairly large and was composed on the same lines as the later Kṛtyakalpataru, since it began with Paribhāṣākāṇḍa and Brahmacārisection, then dealt with Gṛhasthadharmas, Dāna, Śuddhi and Āśauca, Śrāddha, then with Vānaprastha and Pravrajyā (corresponding to the mokṣakāṇḍa of Kalpataru) and ended with Prāyaścittas. These predecessors of the Kalpataru were superseded by the extensive work of Lakṣmīdhara, who himself receded into the background when the works of Hemādri, Caṇḍeśvara, Madanaratna, the Vīramitrodaya, the Mayūkhas of Nīlakaṇṭha became popular. Even before the Kāmadhenu and probably the Smṛtimañjarī also, Bhoja (about 2nd quarter of 11th century A. D.) composed (or patronised the composition of) several works such as the Bhujabala and Rājamārtaṇḍa which exhaustively dealt with the astrological requirements of *saṁskāras* from *puṁsavana* to marriage and also of vratas, yātrā, śāntis, pratiṣṭhā (vide the author's paper on 'King Bhoja and his works on Dharmaśāstra and astrology' in JOR, (Madras), vol. XXIII for 1953–54 pp. 94–127 for five works of Bhoja). So there was nothing very novel in the Kṛtyakalpataru except its exhaustive and logical treatment of all topics and profuse quotations from the Epics and Purāṇas. The Mitākṣarā does

not quote much from the Purāṇas, but Aparārka and Kalpataru quote them profusely. The Kalpataru quotes about 600 verses from Devīpurāṇa, over 200 verses each from Kālikā, Ādityapurāṇa, Nandipurāṇa and Narasiṁhapurāṇa (all Upapurāṇas) while it quotes none at all from Viṣṇudharmottara. The Kalpataru did not probably regard it as authoritative, though Aparārka and the Dānasāgara utilized it to some extent. The learned editor of the extensive Kalpataru, Prof. Aiyangar, has made great efforts to identify the quotations therein from the Purāṇas, and laid all workers and scholars under great obligations. But many quotations have eluded him as will be shown later on. He has been assiduous in pointing out how Hemādri, Caṇḍeśvara and Mitramiśra have copied wholesale from the Kalpataru. It is not impossible that even the Kalpataru might have done the same to some extent as regards its predecessors such as the Pārijāta, Prakāśa, Smṛtimañjarī, and Kāmadhenu. But as those works are not yet available, no positive conclusion can be drawn about its borrowing for the present

The present author edited 286 verses from the Rājamārtaṇḍa (containing 1462 verses) on tithis, vratas and utsavas in ABORI vol. 36, parts III-IV, 1956, pp. 306-339,). It describes several vratas and utsavas like Indradhvajotthāpana and the work is about 75 years older than the Kalpataru. The Kalpataru is studiously silent as regards Bhoja, though it mentions Kāmadhenu, Govindarāja, Prakāśa and Halāyudha and it hardly anywhere mentions the vratas described by the Rājamārtaṇḍa. The Mitākṣarā does mention Dhāreśvara Bhoja. Probably Lakṣmīdhara did not like that a comparison should be instituted between his treatment of vratas and Bhoja's.

Alberuni's work on India translated by Sachau furnishes us with some data about the chronology of Purāṇas. On p. 130 (of Sachau's tr.) he says he heard the following as the Purāṇas viz. Ādi, Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Nārasiṁha, Vāmana, Vāyu, Nanda, Skanda, Āditya, Soma, Sāmba, Brahmāṇḍa, Mārkaṇḍeya, Tārkṣya (i. e Garuḍa), Viṣṇu, Brahma, Bhaviṣya. It will be noted that he mixes in this list Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas. He further states that he had seen only portions of Matsya, Āditya and Vāyu. Then on p. 131 (of Sachau's tr.) there is another list which was read to him from the Viṣṇu (viz. the 18 principal Purāṇas, Śaiva being substituted for Vāyu). Then, on p. 229 (of Sachau's tr.) he sets out from Āditya some details about the regions below the earth and shows how Vāyu differs from it and

on p. 248 he sets out details about Meru from Viṣṇu, Vāyu and Āditya. As he wrote his work in 1030 A. D. one has to conclude that Purāṇas having the names cited by him existed some time before 1000 A. D. at the latest.

Some of the papers of Prof. Hazra and others on the principal Purāṇas and on some of the Upapurāṇas are brought together in one place by Dr. Pusalkar in his work 'Studies in Epics and Purāṇas' pp. 218-225; a few of them are mentioned here. About sixteen papers of Prof. Hazra contributed to various Journals from time to time were included in his work 'Studies in Purāṇik Records of Hindu Rites and customs', which is referred to as PRHR here and H. stands for Prof. Hazra and U. for Upapurāṇa.

CHAPTER XXIII

Brief Notes on individual Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas

Agnipurāṇa—' Present Agni ' (by H.) in I. H. Q. vol. XII pp. 683–691 : ' Studies in genuine Āgneya alias Vahnipurāṇa ' by H. in ' Our Heritage ' vol. I part 2 pp. 209–245 and vol. II part 1 pp. 76–109 ; ' Discovery of genuine Āgneyapurāṇa ' by H. in J. O. I. (Baroda) vol. V (1956) pp. 411–416 (shows that present Agni published by Ānan. Press is not the original Purāṇa, that this was compiled late, while the original Āgneya or Vahni is not yet printed); the Dānasāgara p. 7. verse 63 speaks of an Āgneya which it has discarded apart from one which it has utilized (p. 2 verse 11). As usual with most Purāṇas, the printed Āgneya glorifies itself by saying (in chap. 272. 13 and 17) that in that Mahāpurāṇa Hari resides in the form of different lores and the Āgneya is a great purāṇa full of Veda and all *vidyās*.

Ādipurāṇa (U.)—B. V. vol. VI (1945) pp. 60–73 (H. postulates an earlier and a later version). Vāyu 104.7 mentions an Ādika among the 18 principal purāṇas (including the Brāhma). Alberuni's list (which mixes up Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas) mentions an Ādipurāṇa; an Ādipurāṇa is published by the Veṅk. Press in 29 chapters. H. in ' Studies &c. ' vol. I. pp. 279-303 deals at length with this and tries to establish that there was an earlier Ādi Purāṇa of which no mss. are yet available (p. 211) and holds that it is to be dated between 1203 to 1525 A.D. (' Studies ' p. 288). Ādi and Ādya mean the same thing. But Kullūka on Manu II. 54 quotes some verses from Ādi which are ascribed to Brāhma by G. R. p. 314. The digests make a confusion between Ādi and Ādityapurāṇa. Vide H. in 'Studies' vol. I. pp. 302–303. The printed one is a late compilation and none of the verses quoted by Lakṣmīdhara and Aparārka occur therein (vide ' Studies ' vol. I pp. 286–289).

Ādityapurāṇa—Mentioned by Matsya 53.62 as U. and Alberuni (Sachau I. p. 130, 229, 248); quoted by Kṛtyakalpataru on Rājadharma (about 2 verses), Dāna (about 125), Śrāddha (about 20), Vrata (about 22); the Sm. C. quotes many verses on Āhnika and Śrāddha from both Ādi and Āditya and quotes both

separately on 'śauca' on the same page (I p. 94). Aparārka also quotes many verses from both Ādi and Āditya. The Dānasāgara quotes about forty verses from both the Ādi and Āditya purāṇas.

Ekāmra, (a work of Orissa):—H in P. O. vol. 16 pp. 70–76 and 'Studies &c.' vol. I. p. 341 (assigns it to 10th or 11th century A. D.)

Kālikā:—(an U. in 93 chapters pr. by Veṅk. Press, Bombay); vide H. in A.B.O.R.I. vol. XXII. pp. 1-23; Sharma in I. H. Q. vol. 23 pp. 322–326 (holding that Kālikā was completed during the reign of king Dharmapāla of Kāmarūpa); H. in B. V. vol. 16 (1956) pp. 35–40 questions the view of Sharma; 'Date of Kālikā' by Prof. Gode in J. O. R. (Madras) vol. X. pp. 289–294; Dr. Raghavan in J. O. R. (Madras) vol. XII. pp. 331–360 (shows that there are three separate recensions of the Purāṇa). H. distinguishes between an earlier version and the extant one and places the latter in the 10th or 11th century; on the words of Matsya 53. 60–64 'tad-etebhyo vinirgatam', the Kalpataru explains 'vinirgatam' as 'udbhūtam' (sprung from) and gives the Kālikā as an illustration (Brahmacāri p. 30) of an Upapurāṇa sprung from Mahāpurāṇas; the Kalpataru quotes from it about 100 verses on vrata, on dāna, 14 on gṛhastha, 12 on vyavahāra (about witnesses and ordeals), 5 each on niyatakāla and tīrtha and 2 on brahmacārin; Aparārka quotes it on pp. 15, 226, 377 (15 verses on marriage and house settlements for brāhmaṇas), 924; the Sm. C. II. p. 442 quotes one verse from it on śrāddha. The Dānasāgara quotes many verses from it. The Veṅk. ed. mentions Viṣṇudharmottara in chap. 91. 70 and 92. 2[1414b]; the extant Kālikā would have to be placed before 1000 A. D. Vide p. 809 n 1317 above for the Kālikā saying that the howl of a female jackal is auspicious.

Kalkipurāṇa—Vide H. in 'Studies &c.' vol I. pp. 303–303. There are three editions, all from Calcutta; H. remarks that it is a late work not quoted by any writer (p. 308) and that it is not to be placed later than the 18th century A. D.

Kūrma—(Veṅk. Press ed.); is divided into Pūrvārdha (53 chapters) and Uttarārdha (46 chapters); vide H. in 'Purāṇas

---

1414 b. कालिका 192. 2 says विष्णुधर्मोत्तरे तन्त्रे बाहुल्यं सर्वतः पुनः। बृहस्पतेस्तु सदाचारो बृहस्पत्यास्ते प्रसादतः ॥ and then narrates the story of वेताल and भैरव who required a son.

in history of Smṛti' I. C. vol. I. pp. 587–614 and in 'Smṛti chapters of Kūrma' in I. H. Q. vol. XI. pp. 265–286 and P.R.H.R. pp. 57–75; H. holds that it was originally a Pāñcarātra work, but was altered to make it a Pāśupata one. In several passages the Kūrma speaks of God as one (II. 11. 112–115), but divided into two, Nārāyaṇa and Brahmā (in I. 9. 40) or as Viṣṇu and Śiva (in I. 2. 95) or in three (as in I. 10. 77). The Sm. C. I. p. 199 quotes verses from I. 2. 94, 95, 97–99 which allow a person to worship either Viṣṇu with the mantra (Ṛg. I. 22. 20 or X. 90) or Śiva with Rudragāyatrī, Rudras (Tai. S. IV. 5. 1–11) or 'Tryambakam' (Ṛg. VII. 59. 12, Tai. S. I. 8. 6. 2.) or with 'Om namaḥ Śivāya'. The Sm. C. quotes from Kūrma about 94 verses on āhnika and 19 on śrāddha. In I. 1. 21–22 it states that there were four saṁhitās of the Purāṇa viz. Brāhmī, Bhāgavatī, Saurī and Vaiṣṇavī and that the present one is the Brāhmī in 6000 verses; the Nāradīya (I. 106. 1–22) furnishes a summary of the other three saṁhitās. Padma (Pātālakhaṇḍa 102. 41–42)[1414c] expressly names the Kūrma and quotes a verse from it. Kalpataru (on śrāddha p. 119) quotes two verses from it. Aparārka (pp. 201, 204, 207) quotes three verses from Kūrma (all in relation to fast).

Gaṇeśapurāṇa — Vide H. in JGJRI. vol. 9 pp. 79–99.

Garuḍa — Vide p. 769 above for Ballālasena discarding it; H. in ABORI. vol. 19 pp. 69–79, PRHR pp. 141–145; A. P. Karmarkar on 'Bṛhaspatinītisāra' in Siddha-bhāratī vol. I; pp. 239–240; Dr. L. S. Sternbach in ABORI. vol. 37 pp. 63–110 on 'Cāṇakyarājanītiśāstra and Bṛhaspati-saṁhitā of Garuḍa-purāṇa'; the Garuḍa is quoted by the Sm. C. II. p. 357 (on Ekādaśī); vide H. of Dh. vol. I. pp. 173–175 which show how the Garuḍa either reproduces or summarizes verses from Yāj. I. and III.; chap. 107 of the present Garuḍa gives a summary of the Parāśarasmṛti in 39 verses (vide H. of Dh. vol. I. p. 191). The extant Garuḍa will have to be placed not later than 950 A. D. and not earlier than the 6th century A. D.

Devīpurāṇa—(U.) Vide H. in NIA vol. V. pp. 2–20 (assigning it to the latter half of the 7th century A. D.). Vide p. 769 above

---

1414 c. कौर्मे समस्तपापानां नाशनं शिवभक्तिदम्। इदं पद्यं च शुभाय पुराणज्ञेन भाषितम्। ब्रह्महा मद्यपः स्तेनस्तथैव गुरुतल्पगः। कौर्मे पुराणं श्रुत्वैव मुच्यते पातकात्ततः॥ पद्म (पातालखण्ड 102. 41–42).

for the reasons for which the Dānasāgara refused to utilize[1415] it; it is quoted by Bhujabala-nibandha (about 1040-50 A. D.) on how Saṅkrānti when occurring at different parts of the day affects different people.[1416] Kalpataru quotes Devīpurāṇa in several *kāṇḍas* viz. about 210 verses in Rājadharma (88 verses on fortified capital); 37 verses on worship of Devī on Āśvina śukla 9 with the *bali* of goats and buffaloes, 52 on raising a banner in honour of Devī, 10 verses on gavotsarga on Kārtika-amāvāsyā &c; in Vrata-kāṇḍa about 80 verses (on Durgāṣṭamī, 25 verses on Nandāvrata, 44 verses with a prose passage); 245 verses on *dāna* (such as 28 on Tiladhenu and Ghṛtadhenu pp. 147-151, 56 verses on Vidyādāna pp. 201-207, 98 verses on the construction of *kūpa, vāpī, dīrghikā* &c. pp. 289-299, 27 verses on laying out a park and planting trees pp. 300-303, 10 verses on building a rest-house for ascetics &c. pp. 312-313); in Tīrthakāṇḍa 103 verses (20 verses on śrāddha at a tīrtha without examining character and learning of brāhmaṇas); Niyatakālakāṇḍa quotes 30 verses; Brahmacāri-kāṇḍa quotes only a few; Gṛhasthakāṇḍa quotes 6 verses; Śrāddhakāṇḍa p. 21 quotes only one verse on Maghāśrāddha. Aparārka quotes about 34 verses (3 of which on qualifications of a sthāpaka are interesting, p. 16), as they require that he should possess a knowledge of the Vāma and Dakṣiṇa paths, of the Mātṛ cult, of Pāñcarātra and Śaiva śāstras.

Devībhāgavata (pr. by Veṅk. Press in 12 skandhas)—Vide H. in JOR (Madras) vol. 21 pp. 49-79 (tries to prove that it is younger than the Bhāgavata); 'Devi-bhāgavata and Bhāgavata' by Mr. Tadpatrikar in ABORI vol. 23 pp. 559-562; IHQ vol. 27 pp. 191-196 (Mr. Ramchandran says that the relief in Deogaṛh of Nara-Nārāyaṇa is based on Devībhāgavata IV. 5-10); H. in IHQ vol. 29 pp. 387-392 does not agree with Mr. Ramchandran.

Nandipurāṇa (U). Vide H. on 'Bṛhan-nandikeśvara and Nandikeśvara' in Dr. B. C. Law Presentation vol. part II, pp. 415-419 and in JGJRI vol. II pp. 305-320; Prof. Rangaswami Aiyangar in NIA vol. IV. pp. 157-161 on Nandipurāṇa (holds that the original Purāṇa is probably lost, that verses quoted from it by Lakṣmīdhara are almost all on gifts of various kinds).

1415. Vide above p. 328 for Nandāvrata for the mūlamantra and p. 425 of the Vratakāṇḍa (of Kalpataru) for other Śākta mantras.

1416. पूर्वाह्णे पीड्यते राजा मध्याह्ने च द्विजोत्तमाः। अपराह्णे यथा वैश्याः शूद्राश्चास्तमिते रवौ॥ भुजबल p. 337 quoting देवीपुराण.

Kalpataru on dāna quotes over 200 verses from it on dāna (of which 140 are on Vidyādāna pp. 207–222, 12 verses on Ārogyadāna, which provide for the establishment of an hospital with a physician knowing the eight aṅgas of āyurveda and provided with drugs &c); Aparārka (pp. 396–403) quotes about 100 verses on vidyadāna agreeing with those in Kalpataru and also quotes (pp 365–366) the same verses on Ārogyadāna; Kalpataru on Niyatakāla quotes 13 verses from this purāṇa advocating total abstention from flesh-eating (p. 323) and abstaining from flesh at least on the 4th, 8th, 12th 14th and 15th tithis, on Ṣaḍaśīti and sun's passage from one rāśi to another &c. (pp. 353–360). As this is one of the four upapurāṇas expressly named by the Matsya, as Alberuni mentions a Nanda-purāṇa which (appears to be the same as Nandi) and as it is largely quoted by Lakṣmīdhara, Aparārka and Dānasāgara it is one of the earliest Upapurāṇas and may have been composed in the 8th or 9th century A.D.

Narasiṁhapurāṇa (or Nṛsiṁha). This U. has been dealt with above on pp. 878–882. Kalpataru on vrata quotes 29 verses from it (22 on Gaṇeśacaturthī pp. 84–87 almost all of which are found in the current work, chap. 26. 2–20); Kalpataru on Tīrtha quotes 66 verses from it, almost all of which are in chap. 65. 2–31, 66. 1–9, 20–45 of the current work; Kalpataru on Niyatakāla quotes 65 verses almost all of which are found in chap. 58; Kalpataru on Mokṣa quotes 57 verses, which can be traced in chapters 17, 58, 59, 60, 61; the Dānakāṇḍa of Kalpataru quotes 13 verses (found in chap. 30. 27 ff.), and Brahmacārikāṇḍa quotes four verses; Aparārka quotes about 40 verses from Nṛsiṁha, of which 16 concern *yati* (pp. 951, 965 from chap. 60. 12 ff.), 17 verses deal (p. 140) with *arghya* to the Sun (from 58. 91–93) by the employment of the 16 verses of the Puruṣasūkta for nyāsa on the different parts of the body and also the sixteen (from chap. 62. 5–14) upacāras from āvāhana (invoking to come) to visarjana (bidding adieu) in worship, 5 verses on Narasiṁha-pūjā with the mantra 'Om namo Nārāyaṇāya' (63. 3 and 6). Out of 3½ verses on p. 125 dealing with evening *sandhyā* and homa attributed to this Purāṇa two are the same as Dakṣa-smṛti (II. 28–29). Sm. C. quotes 27 verses on Āhnika from Narasiṁha. It appears that both Kalpataru and Aparārka had a much longer version before them than the present purāṇa. It may be noted that Kṣemaka, who was the last king of the Aila-vaṁśa (acc. to Vāyu 99. 432 and others), is described in the Narasiṁha-purāṇa (chap. 23) as the son of Naravāhana and grand-son of the famous ancient couple

Udayana and Vāsavadattā. The extant purāṇa may be assigned to about 9th century A. D.

Nāradapurāṇā—(Veṅk. Press). Vide H. in I. C. vol. III, p. 477–488, PRHR. pp. 127–133 on 'Bṛhan-nāradīya and Nāradīya' and 'Studies &c.' vol. I pp. 309–345. The Bṛhan-nāradīya was published by the Calcutta Asiatic Society and by the Vaṅgavāsi Press in 38 chapters and about 3600 verses. H. holds that the Bṛhan-nāradīya is a purely sectarian Vaiṣṇava work, is wanting in the characteristics of a purāṇa, that the Nāradīya noticed by the Matsya (53. 23 as containing 23000 verses and in which Nārada proclaimed the dharmas of Bṛhatkalpa) and by the Agni (272. 8) is different from the present Nāradīya and that the extant Nāradīya borrows from the Bṛhan-nāradīya (pp. 336–341 of 'Studies &c.' vol. I). The Nāradīya (Veṅk. Press) is divided into two parts, the first in 125 chapters and the 2nd in 82 chapters (and about 5513 verses in all). Out of the 5513 verses of the 2nd part 3400 deal with various tīrthas and most of the remaining are concerned with the story of Rukmāṅgada and Mohinī. The first part deals with several matters such as praise of Viṣṇu and bhakti, Geography of India, story of Sagara, Bhagīratha and Gaṅgā-māhātmya, a few vratas, Varṇa-dharma, Āśramadharma, pātakas, *sadācāra* and śrāddha. Nāradīya I. 9.40 has a verse which echoes a Kirātārjunīya verse[1417] and proclaims that a brāhmaṇa who enters a Bauddha temple even in a great calamity cannot get rid of the sin by hundreds of expiations, since the Bauddhas are heretics and revilers of[1418] Veda. The first part speaks of Vaiṣṇavāgama (37, 4) and Pañcarātra procedure (53. 9). The Sm. C. quotes many verses from the extant Nāradīya on Ekādaśī and the story of Mohinī. One characteristic passage may be quoted here.[1419] Rukmāṅgada proclaimed that any person more than eight years of age and below 80 years who would eat food on the day of Viṣṇu in his kingdom would be liable to corporal punishment, fine or banishment. Aparārka also (p. 205) quotes two verses about fast on

---

1417. अविवेको हि सर्वेषामापदां परमं पदम् । नारदीय I. 9. 50; compare 'सहसा विदधीत न क्रियामविवेकः परमापदां पदम् ।' किराता० II. 30.

1418. बौद्धालयं विशेद्यस्तु महापद्यपि वै द्विजः । न तस्य निष्कृतिर्दृष्टा प्रायश्चित्तशतैरपि ...बौद्धाः पाखण्डिनः प्रोक्ता यतो वेदविनिन्दकाः ॥ नारदीय 1. 15. 50–52.

1419. अष्टवर्षाधिको मर्त्यं अशीतिं नाष्टपूर्यते (?)। यो भुंक्ते मामके राष्ट्रे विष्णोरहनि पापकृत् । स मे वध्यश्च दण्ड्यश्च निर्वास्यो विषयाद्बहिः ॥ नारदीयपु० q. in स्मृतिच. II. p. 355; in the printed नारद (उत्तरखण्ड) chap. 23. 41 the words are ' यो न कुर्याद्वचो मेऽद्य धर्म्यं विष्णुगतिप्रदम् । स मे दण्ड्यश्च वध्यश्च निर्वास्यो विषयाद् ध्रुवम् ॥.'

Ekādaśī. The above circumstances lead to the conclusion that the present Nāradīya was compiled between 700 and 1000 A. D.

Padmapurāṇa—H. in I. C. vol. IV. pp. 73-95, Mr. M. V. Vaidya in Kane presentation vol. pp. 530–537 (holds that the tīrthayātrā section of Padma is older than the tīrthayātrā section in the Mahābhārata), Dr. Belvalkar in F. W. Thomas Festschrift (pp. 19–28) holds that Padma is based on the Mahābhārata; Prof. Lüders tried to prove that the Ṛṣyaśṛṅga legend in Padma is older than the same legend in the Mahābhārata (vide I. H. Q., vol. XX. p. 209 for Lüder's view); H. in PRHR. (pp. 107–129) states that there are two recensions of the Padma the North Indian and the South Indian, that the former is in five kāṇḍas and the latter in six, that the South Indian recension alone is published in the Ānandāśrama and Veṅk. Press editions, though the arrangement differs in the two editions. H. in PRHR (p. 126) states that the Uttara-kāṇḍa (of the Padma) is later than 900 A. D. and earlier than 1500 A. D. One remarkable fact is that hundreds of verses are common to Matsya and Padma and some writers like Hemādri quote long extracts from the Padma, which others quote from the Matsya. In view of the vast smṛti material in the Matsya and the fact that thousands of verses therefrom are quoted in the medieval nibandhas the present writer is inclined to hold that it is the Padma that is the borrower. There are no materials to assign a definite date for the borrowing, but it is likely that it was before 1000 A. D. Padma (IV. 102. 40-41 and IV. 110. 483) mentions the Kūrma (and a verse is quoted from it) and IV. 5. 32–43 contain such alaṅkāras as Śleṣa and Parisaṅkhyā. The Kalpataru quotes from Padma about 55 verses on vrata, 50 on niyatakāla, 50 on dāna, 12 on tīrtha, only a verse here and there on other kāṇḍas. Aparārka quotes only about 12 verses from it, the Smṛticandrikā only about 25. In the Ānandāśrama edition of Padma there are 48452 verses and 628 chapters. It speaks of the Aśvattha as Bodhisattva (Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa 55. 16) and mentions a place called Vanasthala in Gurjaradeśa (II. 51. 36-37).

Brahmapurāṇa—The one printed at the Ānandāśrama appears to be a late compilation. Vide H. on 'Apocryphal Brahmapurāṇa' in I. C. II. pp. 235–245 and PRHR pp. 145–157. H. states that numerous quotations from the Brahma occurring in the works of Jīmūtavāhana, Aparārka, Ballālasena, Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa and Haradatta are not found in the printed Brahma, that the current Brahma borrows chapters from the Mahābhārata, Viṣṇu, Vāyu and Mārkaṇḍeya and that the present Brahma

was composed between 10th century and 12th century A. D. H. Otto Schrader states that chapters 236–244 of the present Brahma dealing with Sāṅkhya and Yoga are borrowed from the Mahābhārata (I. C. vol. II. pp. 592–93). The Dānasāgara refers to two Brahmapurāṇas one of which it did not utilize (p. 7 verse 63). The Kalpataru quotes at least about 1500 verses from the Brahmapurāṇa (600 in *niyatakāla* section, 66 on tīrtha, 60 on mokṣa, 78 on rājadharma, 21 on gṛhastha, 20 on vyavahāra, verses 15 on vrata, 15 on brahmacārin of which the editor has traced only 9 in the printed text). The Kalpataru on śrāddha quotes several hundred verses from the Brahma, the number of quotations being larger than the quotations from any other Purāṇa, the next being Vāyu and Matsya. On p. 388 of the śrāddha section the Kalpataru quotes from Brahma-purāṇa a few verses about showing honour to Buddha and Bauddha monks on a certain tithi. The printed Brahma contains 245 chapters and 13783 verses. Chapters 70–175 deal with various tīrthas in 4640 verses, chapters 28 to 69 dilate upon several tirthas such as Koṇāditya, Ekāmra, Avanti, Puruṣottama-tīrtha. The whole purāṇa or at least a section seems to come to an end with chapter 175 and from chapter 176 it is Vāsudevamāhātmya that is set forth up to chap. 213 and the narrator is Vyāsa and not Brahmā as in the chapters up to 175. Many of the verses from chapters 42 onwards are quoted by the Tīrthacintāmaṇi (e. g. chap. 43. 1–13 in T. C. p. 58–59, chap. 45. 52–89 in T. C. pp. 61–64, chap. 49 in T. C. pp. 65–72). As Vācaspati flourished in the latter half of the 15th century A. D. (vide H of Dh. vol. I. p 405), the first part of the present Brahmapurāṇa cannot be placed later than the 13th century A. D. The present Brahma has several verses in common with Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu (vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. p. 388 n 870). It is not unlikely that the other Brahmapurāṇa which Ballālasena discarded is the present Brahmapurāṇa and that both Kalpataru and Ballālasena had an older work of the same name before them. The present Brahma was probably compiled in some part through which the Godāvarī (Gautamī) flows in Daṇḍakāraṇya; chap. 88. 18. 123. 117 and 129. 55 state that Daṇḍakāraṇya is the holiest country and that the river Godāvarī flows through it (chap. 129. 62, 66); chap. 88. 22–24 derive Janasthāna on the Gautamī as the sacrificial ground of the kings of the Janaka race.

Brahmavaivarta—A huge work printed by the Ānandāśrama, Poona, in four khaṇḍas (parts) viz. Brahma, Prakṛti,

Gaṇapati and Kṛṣṇajanma. It has some chapters on Dharmaśāstra topics, such as on castes, gifts, vratas, hells, duties of varṇas and āśramas, women. Many of the verses quoted from this Purāṇa in the Sm. C., Hemādri and other writers are not found in the current Purāṇa. Wilson, in the Introduction to the Viṣṇu, says (pp. LXV-LXVII) that it has not the slightest title to be called a Purāṇa. Vide H. in ABORI vol. XIX pp. 75-76 and PRHR pp. 166-167.

Brahmāṇḍa (pub. by Veṅk. Press). It is divided into four pādas (I. 1. 38-39) viz. Prakriyā (5 chapters), Anuṣaṅga (33 chap.), Upodghāta (74 chap.), Upasaṁhāra (4 chap) followed by Lalitopākhyāna in 40 chapters. The Kūrma expressly[1420] states that the Brahmāṇḍa was narrated to the sages engaged in a sattra in the Naimiṣa forest and the Skanda (Prabhāsa-khaṇḍa 2. 8-9) states there was formerly only one Purāṇa called Brahmāṇḍa containing one hundred crores of verses and that later it was distributed into 18 parts. It was probably composed near the rise of the Godāvarī, since it says that that part of the country towards the northern ranges of the Sahya mountain where the Godāvarī rises is the most charming in the whole world and that there a city called Govardhana was founded by Rāma.[1421] In the first two parts it deals with the subjects of creation, the geography of the earth and of Bhāratavarṣa, and the manvantaras, pupils of Vyāsa, the distribution of the Veda Śākhās &c. The third section is the longest and after mentioning Vaivasvata Manvantara and, after dilating upon the creation of gods, asuras, gandharvas, sages and their progeny, it deals at length with all aspects of śrāddha (in chap. 9-20 and 879 verses), describes Paraśurāmā's austerities, his securing of weapons, his slaughter of Kārtavīrya and kṣatriyas, filling five lakes with their blood (in chap. 21-47 and over 1550 verses); then follow in chapters 48-57 the story of Sagara and the bringing down of the Ganges by Bhagīratha, the protection of Gokarṇa from the sea, and the story of Śūrpāraka (chap. 57 and 58), the dynasties of the solar and lunar race (chap. 59ff); then it speaks of Dhanvantari receiving from Bhāradvāja Āyurveda in eight aṅgas; in part IV. it refers to Manus, jñāna, karma, mokṣa &c.

1420. अत्र पूर्वं स भगवानृषीणां सत्रमासताम्। स वै प्रोवाच ब्रह्माण्डं पुराणं ब्रह्मभावितम्॥ कूर्म II. 43. 14.

1421. सह्यस्य चोत्तरान्तेषु यत्र गोदावरी नदी। पृथिव्यामपि कृत्स्नायां स प्रदेशो मनोरमः। तत्र गोवर्धनं नाम पुरं रामेण निर्मितम्। ब्रह्माण्ड II. 16. 43-44. For गोवर्धन vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. p. 710 n 1618.

The Brahmāṇḍa is one of the oldest of the 18 Purāṇas and has hundreds of verses in common with the Vāyu. Vide above p. 852. The Mit. on Yāj. quotes a verse from the Brahmāṇḍa[1422] stating that a person, on touching Śaivas, Pāśupatas, Lokāyatikas and atheists, persons of the three varṇas following forbidden paths and śūdras, should bathe with the clothes on. Aparārka quotes about 75 verses from it of which 43 are concerned with śrāddha. The Sm. C. quotes about 50 verses on Āhnika and Śrāddha, of which ten occur also in Aparārka The Kalpataru does not quote a single verse from it in the sections on vrata, gṛhastha, tirtha, rājadharma, but quotes 16 verses from it on śrāddha, and 16 on mokṣa, none from Niyata. and from Vyavahāra. If we may judge from some of the matters noted here it cannot be placed as early as the Matsya. In III. 48. 8 and 20 it employs long compounds,[1423] mentions Bhīmasena and Nārada[1424] as writers on music (III. 61. 42–43), contains a chapter (III. 62) on Gāndharva, refers to the opinions of former ācāryas, to 30 alaṅkāras of nāṭya and four purposes of such alaṅkāras (chap. 62, verse 22). It may be placed between the 4th and 6th century A. D. For discussion on Brahmāṇḍa, vide Pargiter in AIHT pp. 23, 77 and H. in PRHR (pp. 17–19). The Brahmāṇḍa is very fond of etymologies; vide for example, those of vaiśya and śūdra (II. 7. 157–158), of deva, manuṣya-prajā, rakṣas and yakṣa (II. 8. 9–10, 20, 34), of Tryambaka and Rudra (II. 9. 3–4 and 78), of rājan (in II. 29. 64), of Vasudhā, Medinī and Pṛthivī (II. 37. 1–3), of Atri, Vasiṣṭha, Pulaha and Pulastya (III. 1. 44–46), of Kubera (III. 8. 44–45).

Bṛhad-dharma-purāṇa (U.)—Vide H. in J. of University of Gauhati and 'Studies &c.' vol. I. pp. 115 and 277. It is a work of Bengal of the 13th or 14th century A. D.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa—Accounts of the contents of the Bhaviṣya in Matsya 53. 30–31, Agni 272. 12 and Nāradīya I. 100 do not tally with the printed Bhaviṣya (Veṅk. ed.). It is divided into four *parvans* viz. Brāhma, Madhyama, Pratisarga and Uttara. It is only the Brāhmaparva that can claim an early date. The Pratisarga-parva is a modern fabrication containing stories of

---

1422. शैवान् पाशुपतान् स्पृष्ट्वा लोकायतिकनास्तिकान्। विकर्मस्थान् द्विजान् शूद्रान् सवासा जलमाविशेत्॥ मिता० on या. III. 309, स्मृतिच. I. p. 118.

1423. तस्याग्रेसरसैन्ययूथचरणमक्षुण्णशैलोश्चयक्षोदापूरितनिम्नभागमवनीपालस्य संयास्यतः। ब्रह्माण्ड III. 48. 8.

1424. Vide नाट्यशास्त्र 32. 484 'गान्धर्वमेतत्कथितं मया हि पूर्वं यदुक्तं त्विह नारदेन.'

Adam and Eve, Pṛthvīrāja, and Saṁyogitā, the mlecchas of Dehali, Rāmānuja, Kabīr, Naraśrī (Narsi ?), Nānak, Caitanya, Nityānanda, Raidās, Madhvācārya, Bhaṭṭoji &c. The Bhaviṣyottara is discarded by Ballālasena as unauthoritative, though it was popular in his day (vide. p. 869 above). Aparārka quotes 160 verses from Bhavisyottara on dānas of various kinds. The Sm. C. (I. p. 203) quotes a single verse from the same. Hence the Bhavisyottara cannot be later than 1000 A. D. The Kalpataru quotes hundreds of verses from Bhaviṣya on vratas and many verses in other kāṇḍas, e. g. 55 in brahmacāri, 110 on niyatakāla, 101 on gṛhastha, 100 on rājadharma, 15 on śrāddha. The Mit. quotes[1425] a single verse from Bhaviṣya about donating a golden image of a snake when a man is bitten by a snake. Aparārka quotes about 125 verses from Bhavisya, of which about 90 relate to prāyaścittas. .

One remarkable feature of the extracts from Bhaviṣya in Aparārka is that they quote the views of Aṅgiras, Gautama, Parāśara, Manu, Vasiṣṭha and Śaṅkha. There are several passages quoted by Aparārka from the Bhaviṣya which approximately indicate the age of the current Bhaviṣya.[1426] It also refers to eight Vyākaraṇas in I. 1. 59–61 viz. Brāhma, Aindra, Yāmya, Raudra, Vāyavya, Vāruṇa, Sāvitra and Vaiṣṇava. But these are different from the well-known eight grammars (except Aindra). It mentions the foreign words Āra (Mars) and Koṇa (Saturn)[1427] and states these planets are to be worshipped along with Śiva, Pārvatī, Gaṇeśa, the Sun &c. In prescribing a prāyaścitta for killing a person who is merely a brāhmaṇa by caste the Bhaviṣya prescribes (as one of the alternatives) the prāyaścitta prescribed by Parāśara.[1428] Therefore, the extant Bhaviṣya

---

1425. सर्पदंशनिमित्तं सौवर्णनागदानं प्रतिकृतिरूपेण भविष्यपुराणे सुमन्तुनाभिहितम् 'सुवर्णभारनिष्पन्नं नागं कृत्वा तथैव गाम्। व्यासाय दत्त्वा विधिवत्पितुरानृण्यमाप्नुयात्॥' इति। मिता० on या. III. 6.

1426. अत एव'''स्मृतयः षट्त्रिंशदेवाभिहिताः। मन्वादिस्मृतयो यास्तु षट्त्रिंशत्परिकीर्तिताः। तासां वाक्यानि क्रमशः समासेन ब्रवीमि ते॥ अपरार्क p. 7; इन्द्रश्चन्द्रः काशकृत्स्नापिशली शाकटायनः। पाणिन्यमरजैनेन्द्रा जयन्त्यष्टादिशाब्दिकाः॥. Compare यशस्तिलक I. p. 90 न कैश्चिदैन्द्रजैनेन्द्रचान्द्रापिशलि-पाणिन्याद्यनेकव्याकरणोपदिश्यमान &c.

1427 व्योमकेशं तु सम्पूज्य पार्वतीं भीमजं तथा। कृष्णस्य पितरं तात अर्कमारं सितं तथा। धिषणं क्लेदपुत्रं च कोणं लक्ष्म च भारत। अपरार्क p. 564.

1428. जातिमात्रं यदा हन्याद् ब्राह्मणो ब्राह्मणं शुह। '''प्रायश्चित्तं तदा कुर्याद्विधं पापविशुद्धये। धनं वा जीवनायालं गृहं वा सपरिच्छदम्। यद्वा पराशरोक्तेन प्रायश्चित्तेन शुध्यति। अपरार्क p. 1061, who then sets out ten verses from पराशरस्मृति, all of which except three occur in the पराशरस्मृति chap. XII pp. 50–51 of Jīvānanda's ed.

cannot be placed earlier than about the 6th or 7th century A. D. Vide H. in I. C. vol. III. pp. 223–229 and PRHR pp. 167–173 for Bhaviṣya and JOI (Baroda) vol. III. pp. 8–27 for Bhaviṣyottara. The Bhaviṣya mentioned in Vāyu (99. 267 tān sarvān kīrtayiṣyāmi· Bhaviṣye paṭhitān nṛpān। tebhyaḥ pare ca ye cānye utpatsyante mahīkṣitaḥ ॥) is not the present one but the ancient Bhaviṣyat mentioned by Āp.·Dh. S. (vide p. 817 and n 1328 above). The Varāhapurāṇa expressly mentions Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa twice (177. 34 and 51).[1429] The second reference is quite interesting. It appears to say[1429a] that the Purāṇa well-known as Bhaviṣya was revised by Sāmba who then established an image of the Sun.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa. None of the early works such as the Mit., Aparārka, Kalpataru, the Smṛticandrikā draw upon this. The Dānasāgara knew it, but, as the Bhāgavata did not contain a disquisition on dānas, the author passed it over. Its date is very controversial, ranging from the 5th century A.D. to the 10th. Dr. Pusalkar (in 'Studies in Epics and Purāṇas' 1953, pp. 214–216) brings together most of the papers on this subject; Shri S. S. Sastri in ABORI vol 14 pp. 241–249 on 'the two Bhāgavatas' claims that the Devībhāgavatapurāṇa is earlier than the Bhāgavata, while H. in JOR (Madras) vol. 21 (pp. 48–79) takes the opposite view, viz. that the Devībhāgavata is much younger than the Bhāgavata. In 'Date of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa' by B. N. Krishnamūrti Sharma in ABORI. vol. 14 pp. 182–218 it is argued that the Bhāgavata is as old as the 5th century A. D. and he cites in support certain passages from the Mokṣadharma of the Mahābhārata (Kumbhakonam edition), but the critical edition from Poona treats those passages as apocryphal. Prof. Das-Gupta in the 4th volume of his 'Indian Philosophy' deals with this Purāṇa, but his views are criticized in JBRS vol. 36 pp. 9–50. Vide H. in NIA vol. I. pp. 522–528. The Padma part VI. (chapter 189–194) contains a *Māhātmya* of Bhāgavatapurāṇa in 518

1429. 'भविष्यत्पुराणमिति ख्यातं कृत्वा पुनर्नवम्। साम्बः सूर्यप्रतिष्ठां च कारयामास तत्त्ववित्॥ वराह 177. 51. The Veṅk. ed. reads (177. 55) 'भविष्यमिति विख्यातं ख्यातं etc.'.

1429 a. The Varāha mentions (178. 5–7) three temples of the Sun, one to the south of the Yamunā, the 2nd in the middle called Kālapriya and the third to the west at Mūlasthāna (modern Multān). The Bhaviṣya mentions three important places of sun-worship (viz Muṇḍīra, Kālapriya and Mitravana). I agree with Mr. Dilipkumar Bisvas that Muṇḍīra is modern Modhera in North Gujerat (vide p. 30 of summary of Proceedings of 15th Indian History Congress) where there has been a sun temple for about a thousand years.

verses. The author of the Purāṇa is said to be a native of the Tamil country by Mr. M. R. Majumdar in IHQ vol. 8. pp. 49–53. The present writer thinks that it is a late Purāṇa, since even in the Mokṣakāṇḍa (of Kalpataru) it is not cited, while about 300 verses are cited from the Viṣṇupurāṇa in that kāṇḍa alone. Vide note 1604 below. No reliable and cogent evidence has been adduced to prove that the current Bhāgavata can be placed earlier than the 9th century A. D.

Matsyapurāṇa (Ānandāśrama ed.). It has 291 chapters and 14062 verses. It is one of the ancient Purāṇas and has perhaps the largest number of smṛti chapters among Purāṇas. Many verses of the Manusmṛti and the Mahābhārata occur in it. Some verses of Yāj. also occur in Matsya e. g. Yāj. I. 295 is Matsya 93. 2, Yāj. II. 279. 295–6 and 303 are the same as Matsya 227. 200, 202–203 and 204. It appears that the Matsya holds the balance between Śiva and Viṣṇu. It glorifies not only Viṣṇu in the Matsya avatāra but devotes 1570 verses to the slaughter of Tārakāsura and 623 to the destruction of Tripura, both by Śiva. The Vāmanapurāṇa (12. 48) speaks of it as the principal among Purāṇas.

The Mit. on Yāj. I. 297 expressly quotes all the nine verses of chap. 94 of the Matsya (about the form of the images of the planets) and two verses from chap. 93 (11–12) about the position to be assigned to each with white grains of rice in a maṇḍala. The Kalpataru quotes hundreds of verses from Matsya on vrata, quotes about 750 on dāna from Matsya (all of which except 20 are identified in the present Matsya by the editor); about 410 on Rājadharmakāṇḍa, 157 verses on tīrtha (of which 100 are identified by the editor in the Matsya), 115 verses in Gṛhasthakāṇḍa, 112 verses on śrāddha, about 67 on niyatakāla (all except 12 identified), 18 in vyavahārakāṇḍa, 6 in brahmacāri and 2 in mokṣa, in all about 2000 verses. Aparārka quotes about 400 verses from Matsya (about 250 being on dāna). It is not necessary after the preceding statement to go into the large number of verses quoted in Dānasāgara, Smṛti-candrikā and Hemādri. It may be said without fear of contradiction that long before 1000 A. D. the Matsya-purāṇa had the same arrangement and presented almost the same appearance as at present. This is more than what can be said about the other Purāṇas except Viṣṇu, Vāyu, probably Bhaviṣya (I), Mārkaṇḍeya.

In the present author's opinion the Matsya is among the best preserved and the earliest of the 18 Purāṇas. It may be

dated between 200 A. D. to 400 A. D. The author does not wish to deny that a few verses here and there might have been interpolated at a later date.

Vide H. on the dates of the smṛti chapters of Matsya in ABORI vol. 17 pp. 1–36 and PRHR pp. 26–52 and Prof. Ramchandra Dikshitar on 'Matsyapurāṇa, a study' (Madras, 1935, pp. 1–140). Four verses from a Svalpa-matsya-purāṇa are quoted in the Pitṛdayitā (p. 92) of Aniruddha (about 1160 A. D.) and there is a paper thereon by Shri Manoranjana Shastri in J. G. J. R. I. vol. IX pp. 183–188. Matsya and Padma (as stated before) agree verbatim in many chapters on tīrthas and vratas. Śaṅkarācārya quotes a verse from Paurāṇikas which is Matsya.[1430] Among the sages to whom water is offered in *tarpaṇa* are included (by Matsya) Kapila, Āsuri, Voḍhu and Pañcaśikha. The first two and the last are mentioned in the Sāṅkhyakārikā as the three great founders of the Sāṅkhya system. Vararuci is said to be a profound scholar of Nāṭya-veda. In chap. 24 the Purāṇa refers to the fact that the Apsaras Urvaśī and her friend Citralekhā were kidnapped by a demon called Keśin, who was vanquished by Purūravas and Urvaśī was released and was given by Indra to Purūravas. While she was acting the part of Lakṣmī in a drama called Lakṣmī-svayaṁvara composed by Bharata, she, being engrossed in her passion for Purūravas, forgot the proper *abhinaya* taught by Bharata and was cursed by Bharata to be a creeper. It is difficult to say whether the Matsya got its inspiration for this story from the Vikramorvaśīya or whether the great poet Kālidāsa was influenced by the story in the Matsya. The story in Matsya and in Kālidāsa's drama agree very closely as regards names and incidents. The Matsya says (24. 24) that for vanquishing Keśin Purūravas employed Vāyavya-astra. The drama also mentions it (I.).

1430. तथा चाहुः पौराणिकाः । अचिन्त्याः खलु ये भावा न तांस्तर्केण योजयेत् । प्रकृतिभ्यः परं यच्च तदचिन्त्यस्य लक्षणम् ॥ शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 27. This is मत्स्य 113. 6. This verse occurs also in भीष्मपर्व 5. 12 but there the reading is साधयेत् for योजयेत्. Besides, the word पौराणिक (पुराणमधीते इति पौराणिकः acc. to पाणिनि IV. 2. 59) suggests that the ācārya refers to a पुराण and not to the महाभारत. कपिलश्चासुरिश्चैव वोढुः पञ्चशिखस्तथा। सर्वे ते तृप्तिमायान्तु मद्दत्तेनाम्बुनाखिलाः ॥ मत्स्य 102 18 quoted in स्मृतिच. I. 193. The सांख्यकारिका says at the end 'एतत्पवित्रमग्र्यं मुनिरासुरयेऽनुकम्पया प्रददौ। आसुरिरपि पञ्चशिखाय तेन च बहुधा कृतं तन्त्रम् ॥'. दोग्धा वररुचिश्चैव नाट्यवेदस्य पारगः । मत्स्य 10. 25; लक्ष्मीस्वयंवरं नाम भरतेन प्रवर्तितम् । मत्स्य 24. 28.

The only points of difference are : in the drama Lakṣmī-svayaṁvara is said to have been composed by Sarasvatī, while Matsya does not say so. Besides, the Purāṇa says that Urvaśī was cursed by Bharata to be a creeper, while Kālidāsa says nothing of the kind and shows that her being reduced to the condition of a creeper was due to Kumāra (Kārtikeya). The decision depends on the exact dating of the Matsya from other evidence. I am inclined to believe that Kālidāsa was familiar with the episode related in the Matsya. There are scholars who believe that Kālidāsa flourished under Vikramāditya about 57 B. C. The present writer does not subscribe to this belief. There is hardly any reliable or positive evidence to show that a powerful ruler called Vikramāditya ruled Northern and Central India about 57 B. C. The tradition of the nine jewels is of no use and if relied upon would make Vikramāditya rule about the 5th or 6th century A.D., since Amarasiṁha, Varāhamihira and Kālidāsa would be contemporaries. A coin of the Gupta Emperor Candragupta II (Allen's Catalogue of coins, pp. 35 ff.) has क्षितिमवजित्य सुचरितैर्दिवं जयति विक्रमादित्यः. The present writer believes that the most probable date for Kālidāsa is between 350 to 450 A. D.

Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa — There are two editions, viz. B. J. edition (of 1862) and the Veṅk. Press ed. The present author has mainly used the latter for quotations. The two differ slightly as to the number of verses in almost each chapter e. g. there are 270 verses in chap. 8 of B.J. edition and 287 in Veṅk. ed.; chapter 16 of the Veṅk. edition corresponds to chapters 16–18 of the other edition. There are 134 chapters in the Veṅk. edition and 137 in B. J. edition. Pargiter translated into English the Mārkaṇḍeya. In the first 42 chapters (B. J. ed.) Mārkaṇḍeya takes hardly any part, but in the remaining chapters he is the principal speaker. This is a peculiar Purāṇa. The first chapter opens with four questions put by Jaimini to Mārkaṇḍeya about Mahābhārata saga, viz. (1) why nirguṇa Vāsudeva assumed a human form, (2) how Draupadī became the wife of five brothers, (3) Balarāma performed expiation of brahmahatyā by pilgrimage (and not by his own death), (4) how the five unmarried sons of Draupadī, themselves great warriors, met death helplessly although they had the great Pāṇḍava heroes to protect them. Mārkaṇḍeya directs him to go to wise birds in the Vindhya mountain and the answers are given in chapters 4 to 7. One wonders why Jaiminī said to be a pupil of Vyāsa in the Purāṇas did not go to Vyāsa but to Mārkaṇḍeya. A portion of this Purāṇa is called

Devimāhātmya or Saptaśatī[1431] (chapters 78–90 of Veṅk. ed. and 81–93 of B. J. edition) and is deemed by modern Sanskrit scholars to be an interpolation. But even if it is an interpolation it must have been made before the 10th century, as the oldest known ms. of it is dated 998 A.D. and probably before 600 A. D. The Mārkaṇḍeya has practically no verses on vrata, pilgrimages or śānti, but dilates on the duties of āśramas, on rājadharma, śrāddha, hells, karmavipāka, sadācāra, yoga, (explained by Dattātreya to Alarka), stories of Kārtavīrya, his grandson Kuvalayāśva and of Madālasā, creation, manvantaras, geography &c. It has hardly any sectarian bias; prayers and invocations are few except in the Devīmāhātmya. The present Purāṇa has, as indicated above, three different and disconnected sections viz. chapters 1–42 (Veṅk. ed.), where the wise birds figure as speakers, chapters 43 to end where Mārkaṇḍeya and Kroṣṭuki, a disciple, carry on the discourse, except in Devīmāhātmya, which is the third and an independent section.

The Kalpataru on mokṣa quotes about 120 verses from Mārkaṇḍeya on yoga. almost all of which are found in the printed text. It quotes on brahmacārikāṇḍa 9 verses, 12 on śrāddha, 17 on niyatakāla, 19 on gṛhastha, 3 on rājadharma and one on vyavahāra. Aparārka quotes about 85 verses from the Mārkaṇḍeya of which 42 are on yoga and the rest on śrāddha, giving alms, hospitality, śuddhi &c. The Sm. C. quotes 15 verses from Mārkaṇḍeya on āhnika, 40 verses on śrāddha. Mārkaṇḍeya quotes several verses from Manu and Mahābhārata. Mārkaṇḍeya contains some long drawn out rūpakas as in 3.59–70 (where prajñā is said to be a fort-wall and the soul as king therein) and 35. 8–13 (ahamityaṅkurotpannaḥ &c.). It contains the popular idea that for married women long stay with their relatives (in the family of birth) does not conduce to good reputation and that the desire of her relatives (by blood) is that a married woman should stay in her husband's house.[1432] The Mārkaṇḍeya says that the root of all

---

1431. Vide above p. 155 note 396 about the Saptaśatī for a description of the Devīmāhātmya, which has only 589 verses (and not 700 as the name implies) in Veṅk. ed. and 573 in B. I. ed. The verse सर्वमङ्गलमाङ्गल्ये cited above on p. 176 n. 454a (from देवीमाहात्म्य) is quoted in the Dadhimati-mātā inscription (found in the Jodhpur State) dated 289 of the Gupta era (E. I. vol. XI p. 299 at 303). The inscription being of 608 A. D., it follows that the verse taken from the Devīmāhātmya, is earlier than 600 A.D.

1432. बान्धवेषु चिरं वासो नारीणां न यशस्करः। मनोरथो बान्धवानां नार्या भर्तृगृहे स्थितिः॥ मार्क० 74. 19; compare शाकुन्तल V 'सतीमपि ज्ञातिकुलैकसंश्रयां जनोऽन्यथा भर्तृमतीं विशङ्कते।'

unhappiness is the idea that one is the owner. (of this and that) and that bliss comes with the idea 'nothing is mine'.[1433] In chap. 160. 39 it refers to *lagna* and *horā*. It puts forward the doctrine of the Gītā that actions done without any desire for their reward do not tend to become chains binding down a man to saṁsāra. On the other hand, this Purāṇa narrates the story of Datta[1434] or Dattātreye who imparted instruction on yoga to Alarka (from chap. 16 ff), but who is represented as an avatāra of Viṣṇu given to drinking intoxicants, as fond of the company of women, as staying near a water reservoir constructed with wood and stones on the Sahya (16. 132) and is called Avadhūta (17. 3). In chap. 54 it is said (just as in Brahmāṇḍa cited above p. 895) that the country in the north ranges of Sahya and near the Godāvarī is the most charming in the world.

On the whole this is one of the early purāṇas and may be assigned to a date between the 4th to 6th century A. D.

Liṅgapurāṇa (Veṅk. ed.). It has 11000 verses as stated in chap. II. 5. The Kalpataru on tīrtha quotes about one thousand verses from it on Avimuktaka (Banaras) and the sub-tīrthas therein. Aparārka quotes six verses from it on Śivapūjā on the 8th and 14th tithis and bath and śrāddha in eclipses. The Sm. C. quotes a few verses from it on bath in eclipses, Veda study &c. According to the Dānasāgara (p. 7 verse 64) there was another Liṅgapurāṇa of 6000 verses which it had not utilised. Vide H. in I. C. vol. IV. pp. 415–421 and in PRHR pp. 92–96.

Varāhapurāṇa (B. I. edition). It has 217 chapters and 9654 verses, besides a few chapters entirely in prose (such as 81–83, 86–87 and 74 on *bhuvanakośa*) and a few in mixed prose and verse (such as 80, 84, 85, 88, 89). It is a Vaiṣṇava Purāṇa and begins with the well-known verse 'Nārāyaṇam namaskṛtya' and is supposed to have been narrated to the Earth by Viṣṇu in the

---

1433. ममेति मूलं दुःखस्य न ममेति च निर्वृतिः। मार्क० 35. 6; न च बन्धाय तत्कर्म भवत्यनभिसन्धितम्। मार्क० 92. 15.

1434. The story of दत्तात्रेय and of his boons (वरs) to कार्तवीर्य occurs in several Purāṇas. Vide मत्स्य 43. 15 ff, ब्रह्म 13. 160 ff. The ब्रह्माण्ड III. 8. 84 quotes a पौराणिकश्लोक 'अत्रेः पुत्रं महात्मानं शान्तात्मानमकल्मषम्। दत्तात्रेयं तनुं विष्णोः पुराणज्ञाः प्रचक्षते ॥'. In the भागवत (I. 3. 52 ff) twenty-two avatāras of विष्णु are mentioned out of which Dattātreya is the 6th who propounded ānvīkṣikī (Adhyātmavidyā) to Alarka and Prahlāda. In the मार्कण्डेय (Veṅk.) 17. 10–13 दत्तात्रेय says 'ये च मां पूजयिष्यन्ति गन्धमाल्यादिभिर्नराः। मांसमद्योपहारैश्च मिष्टान्नैश्चात्मसंमतैः। ...तेषामहं परां पुष्टिं पुत्रदारधनादिकीम्। प्रदास्याम्यवधूतश्च हनिष्याम्यवमन्यताम्॥'.

Boar incarnation. It is remarkable that Vyāsa does not appear in the Purāṇa, though the Sūta figures at the beginning of several chapters (e. g. chap. 1, 2, 39, 50, 127, 137–138, 148, 151, 181, 213). It deals with most of the general topics of Dharmaśāstra such as vrata, tīrtha, dāna, images and their worship, āśauca, śrāddha, karmavipāka, narakas, cosmology and geography, prāyaścitta &c. The Kalpataru quotes 150 verses from it on vrata (most of which are traced by the editor), 40 verses on śrāddha (none of which is traced), 250 verses on tīrtha (many of which are traced), 17 on niyatakāla (half traced), five on dāna (all traced), 4 in gṛhasthakāṇḍa (not traced). One peculiarity is that it mentions some tīrthas like Lohārgala and Stutasvāmī which are not described in other Purāṇas. Aparārka quotes about 55 verses from it on several topics.

The Brahmapurāṇa[1435] refers to a Vārāha text laying down a śrāddha for pitṛs on the Full Moon when the sun is in Virgo. The Bhaviṣyottara also (32. 12) refers to Varāhavacana. For the priority of the Bhaviṣya to Varāha vide above p. 898. Varāha refers to a śaka prince called Nandavardhana (in chap. 122. 34) and verse 56 refers to a śaka king.

Vide H. in ABORI vol. 18 pp. 321–337. It is difficult to assign a date to the Varāhapurāṇa. It is not one of the early Purāṇas. In any event it is earlier than the 10th century A.D.

Vāmanapurāṇa (Veṅk. ed.). It is a short purāṇa as compared with Matsya, Vāyu, Varāha &c. It has 5451 verses in the Veṅk. ed. There is prose in chapters 26, 44 and 93. For its size it contains many legends, such as Śaṅkara cutting off a head of Brahmā, the story of Prahlāda and his grandson Bali and the latter's downfall, the greatness of Devī and her exploits, marriage of Śiva and Umā at the request of gods, the birth of Kārtikeya and explanation of his various names, the story of Daṇḍa who was cursed by Śukra for rape, enmity between Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra, Gajendramokṣa &c. It briefly deals with many of the usual dharmaśāstra subjects viz. tīrtha, sadācāra, āśramadharma, sāmānyadharma, vrata, karmavipāka &c. The Kalpataru quotes from Vāmana about 88 verses on tīrtha (only some of which have been traced), about 80 verses

---

1435. नान्दीमुखानां कर्तव्यं कन्याराशिगते रवौ। पौर्णमास्यां तु कर्तव्यं वाराहवचनं यथा। ...पिण्डमिच्छन्ति पितरः कन्याराशिगते रवौ। कन्यां गते सवितरि यान्यहानि तु षोडश। क्रतुभिस्तानि तुल्यानि देवो नारायणोऽब्रवीत्॥ ब्रह्म 220. 44–47 (Ānan. ed.).

on vrata, 14 verses on dāna (which are also quoted by Aparārka p. 364) and 11 verses on niyatakāla.[1436]

The Vāmana-purāṇa mentions Kāmaśāstras in 91. 73 and Maṅgalavāra (Tuesday) in 41. 24. It has been stated above p. 899 that it expressly mentions Matsya as the best among Purāṇas. The story of king Daṇḍa (in 63. 19 ff.) who perished along with the kingdom because he tried to violate Śukra's daughter appears to be an echo from Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra (I. 6 p. 11 'Dāṇḍakyonāma Bhojaḥ kāmāt brāhmaṇakanyām abhimanyamānaḥ sabandhurāṣṭro vinanāśa.'). It states that the king is called *rājan* because he keeps the subjects contented, just as Kālidāsa says.[1437] It says that Umā was so called because[1438] she was forbidden to practise 'tapas' in the words 'u mā' and that Śiva assumed the form of a Vedic student carrying a staff of Āṣāḍha (Palāśa) and wearing a girdle of Muñja grass. This also appears like an echo of Kumārasambhava V.

The Sm.C. I. p. 168 quotes the two verses in which the Vāmana prescribes that a man after a bath and homa should leave his house (for business &c.) after touching certain objects deemed to be auspicious (noted below).

Taking all these matters into consideration the Vāmana purāṇa would have to be placed between 600 to 900 A. D. Vide H. in IHQ XI. pp. 115–130 and PRHR pp. 76–92.

1436. On p. 358 of the Kalpataru on Niyatakāla three verses are quoted as from Vāmana-purāṇa which the editor was not able to trace. They are three verses from Vāmana 14. 48–51 quoted above on p. 71 note 178. The first of those three verses is quoted from the Vāmana-purāṇa by Bhujabala-nibandha p. 343. The last two of the three verses are quoted from Vāmana by Sm. C. p. 125

1437. ततो राजेति शब्दोऽस्य पृथिव्यां रञ्जनादभूत् । वामन 47. 24; compare 'राजा प्रकृतिरञ्जनात् ।' रघु. IV. 12; राजा प्रजारञ्जनलब्धवर्णः परन्तपो नाम यथार्थनामा । रघु. VI. 21.

1438. तपसो वारयामास उ मेत्येवाब्रवीच्च सा । वामन 51. 21; compare उ मेति मात्रा तपसो निषिद्धा पश्चादुमाख्यां सुमुखी जगाम । कुमार० 1. 26; बटुरूपं समाधाय (समास्थाय ?) आषाढी सुचमेखली । वामन 51. 45; compare अथाजिनाषाढधरः प्रगल्भवाक्... शरीरबद्धः प्रथमाश्रमो यथा ॥ कुमार० V. 30; दूर्वां दधिं सर्पिरथोदकुम्भं धेनुं सवत्सां वृषभं सुवर्णम् । मृद्गोमयं स्वस्तिकमक्षतानि लाजा मधु ब्राह्मणकन्यकाश्च ॥ श्वेतानि पुष्पाणि च शोभनानि हुताशनं चन्दनमर्कबिम्बम् । अश्वत्थवृक्षं च समालभेत ततस्तु कार्यो निजजातिधर्मः ॥ वामन 14, 36–37 q. in स्मृतिच. I. p. 168.

Vāyupurāṇa (Ānandāśrama ed.). This has 112 chapters and 10991 verses. It appears to have been divided like the Brahmāṇḍa into four pādas, Prakriyā (chap. 1–6), Anuṣaṅgā (chap. 7–64), Upodghāta (65–99) and Upasaṁhāra (100–112). In the first chap., the first verse is the famous one 'Nārāyaṇam namaskṛtya' and the 2nd eulogises Vyāsa (both these are not found in several mss.). The third verse refers to *bhakti* for Śiva. Chap. 104 is not found in many mss. and the chapters at the end on Gayāmāhātmya are deemed to be later additions by some scholars. There is Śaiva bias in several chapters such as chap. 20. 31–35 (with a prose passage containing Vedic texts), 24. 91–165 (called Śarvastotra), chap. 55 (Śivastuti put in the mouth of Viṣṇu), chap. 101. 215–330. Probably to counterbalance this the chapters on Gayā were added and also the praise of Viṣṇu in chap. 98 where Dattātreya, Vyāsa, Kalkin are said to be avatāras of Viṣṇu, but Buddha is not mentioned. Chapter 99 is the longest one in the Purāṇa, contains 464 verses and is full of legendary material and historical references. There are several verses in the Purāṇa that appear also in the Mahābhārata, Manu and Matsya. For its relation to Brahmāṇḍa vide pp. 852, 896 above. This Purāṇa, like the Matsya, contains much Dharmaśāstra material. It is one of the oldest and most authoritative Purāṇas, though it contains some later additions.

The Vāyu is not quoted in the vrata and niyatakāla sections of the Kalpataru, but it is largely quoted in several other sections. From the Vāyupurāṇa Kalpataru quotes about 160 verses on śrāddha[1439] (of which the editor identified only about 21), about 35 on mokṣa (most traced), 22 on tīrtha, 7 on *dāna*, 5 in brahmacāri and 5 in gṛhastha. Aparārka quotes about 75 verses from Vāyu out of which 60 concern śrāddha and the rest deal with fast, dravyaśuddhi, dāna, sannyāsa and yoga. The Sm. C. quotes only about 24 verses from Vāyu on śrāddha, on atithi, on Agnihotra and fuel-sticks.

The Vāyu makes a passing reference to the Gupta dynasty (vide p. 852 above), it knows the yuga of five years (50. 183),

1439. In spite of great efforts the learned editor of Kalpataru has failed to notice in the Kalpataru several verses on śrāddha, tīrtha and mokṣa. I have succeeded in identifying a few more, viz. Vāyu 75. 24–25 and 45–46 occur in Kalpataru on śrāddha (pp. 216–217). In Kalpataru on śrāddha (p. 168 on Gayā) there are eleven verses quoted from Vāyu left untraced by the editor, which are found in Vāyu 77. 98–103 and 105–109. On p. 300 of gṛhasthakāṇḍa two verses not traced are Vāyu 62. 161–162.

and Meṣa, Tulā (50. 196), Makara and Siṁha (Jupiter therein) in 82. 41–42. Chapter 87 describes Gītālaṅkāras basing its treatment on the doctrines of pūrvācāryas. Brahmāṇḍa III. 62 is a similar chapter on the same subject and has almost the same verses.

As it refers to the kings of the Gupta dynasty and as Bāṇa refers to it in the Kādambarī and the Harṣacarita, it must be placed between 350 A. D. and 550 A. D. This date is corroborated in several ways. Śaṅkarācarya in his Bhāṣya on Vedāntasūtrā II. 1. 1 quotes a verse as from a Purāṇa, which is Vāyu except[1440] for one word. In another place Śaṅkara quotes a verse as smṛti which is found in Vāyu with slight variations. Another verse which is cited as smṛti by Śaṅkarācārya occurs in Vāyu. The Tattvavaiśāradī of Vācaspati on Yogasūtra I. 25 expressly quotes from Vāyu 12. 33 and 10. 65–66.

Vide Prof. Dikshitar on 'Some aspects of the Vāyupurāṇa' (1933, 52 pages, University of Madras); H. in IHQ. vol. 14 pp. 131–139 and PRHR pp. 13–17; Shri D. R. Patil's 'Cultural History from the Vāyupurāṇa' (1946, Poona, a Ph. D. thesis).

Viṣṇupurāṇa—(Veṅk. Press edition and another published by Messrs. Gopal Narayan and Co. in śaka 1824 with two commentaries, one called Vaiṣṇavakūtacandrikā of Ratnagarbha Bhaṭṭācārya and the other called Viṣṇucittī). The present text is divided into six *aṁśas*, 126 chapters and about 6000 verses. There are many chapters in prose alone such as in 4th aṁśa chapters 7, 8, 9 and many in mixed prose and verse as in aṁśa 4 chap. 1, 2, 6, 11, 12 &c. As stated above this purāṇa agrees with the definition of purāṇa as *pañca-lakṣaṇa* far more than any other purāṇa. This purāṇa is declared to Maitreya by

---

1440. अतश्च संक्षेपमिमं ...तवाप्ति भूयः ॥ इति पुराणे । शंकराचार्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 1; वायु I. 205 is the same, except that for नारायणः, वायु reads महेश्वरः. Vide p. 825 note 1347 for this verse. This change was probably made by some later redactor on account of the obvious Śaiva bias of the Purāṇa. The previous verse (वायु I. 204) states that महेश्वर is the creator of नारायण. "अथवा-मनो महान् मतिर्ब्रह्मा पूर्बुद्धिः ख्यातिरीश्वरः । प्रज्ञा संविच्चितिश्चैव स्मृतिश्च परिपठ्यते ॥ इति स्मृतेः । शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. I. 4. 1. Vide वायु 4. 27–28 मनो महान्मतिर्ब्रह्मा भूर्बुद्धिः ख्यातिरीश्वरः । प्रज्ञा चितिः स्मृतिः संविद्विपुरं चोच्यते बुधैः ॥. One ms. of वायु does read पूर्बुद्धिः; द्यां मूर्धानं यस्य विप्रा वदन्ति खं वै नाभिं चन्द्रसूर्यौ च नेत्रे । दिशः श्रोत्रे विद्धि पादौ क्षितिं च सोऽचिन्त्यात्मा सर्वभूतप्रणेता ॥ इत्येवंजातीयका स्मृतिरिहोदाहर्तव्या । शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. I. 2. 25; compare वायु 9. 120 द्यौर्मूर्धानं ...स्तुवन्ति...नेत्रे । दिशः श्रोत्रे चरणौ चास्य भूमिः सोऽ...भूतप्रसूतिः ॥

Parāśara (son of Vasiṣṭha), which he received from Sārasvata, who received it from king Purukutsa on the Narmadā, who heard it from Dakṣa and others who learnt it from Brahmā.

Five out of the seven verses of Brahmāṇḍa III. 68. 97–103 are the same as Viṣṇu IV. 10. 23–27 (about what Yayāti said about tṛṣṇā). The same occur in Brahma-purāṇa 12. 40–46. It is likely that all borrow from the Mahābhārata, Ādiparva 75. 44 ff., 85. 9 ff. and Anuśāsana 7. 21 ff. The Mit. on Yājñavalkya III. 6 quotes on Nārāyaṇabali about 14 verses of the Viṣṇu-purāṇa. The Kalpataru on Mokṣa quotes 250 verses from the Viṣṇu (most of which have been identified), 70 on niyatakāla (almost all traced), 21 on brahmacāri, 28 on śrāddha (only one not traced), 21 on tīrtha (all traced), about 45 on gṛhastha-kāṇḍa.[1441] Aparārka cites about 75 verses from the Viṣṇupurāṇa and the Smṛticandrikā about 100. The Kāvyaprakāśa[1441a] (IV.) quotes two verses from this (V. 13. 21–22 about a gopakanyā attaining final release by her thorough unswerving devotion to Lord Kṛṣṇa). The Viṣṇupurāṇa teaches in some places the sublime philosophy of *advaita*;[1442] for example, it says 'He who seeks mokṣa should strive for treating all as equal, gods, men, beasts, birds, trees and creeping life are all the form of the Infinite Viṣṇu, though appearing as distinct from each other; one who realizes this should look upon the world as his own self &c.' In another place the Viṣṇupurāṇa[1443] states 'The mind alone is the cause of the bondage of men and their release; mind that is attached to the objects of the senses tends to bondage, but when it is beyond attachment to them, it tends to mokṣa'. It teaches the central doctrine of the Gītā that actions done without an eye to the reward or fruit thereof do not lead to bondage,[1444]

1441. The editor has traced several verses from गृहस्थकाण्ड, but he did not notice that the three verses on pp. 272–273 (about brāhmaṇas having to undergo far more trouble than the śūdra) are Viṣṇu VI. 2. 22–24.

1441 a. The two verses begin 'तद्प्राप्ति°' and 'चिन्तयन्ती...' and are quoted as examples of रसध्वनि based on अतिशयोक्ति by the काव्यप्रकाश.

1442. यतितव्यं समत्वे च निर्वाणमपि चेच्छता । देवा मनुष्याः पशवः पक्षिवृक्षसरीसृपाः । रूपमेतदनन्तस्य विष्णोर्भिन्नमिव स्थितम् ॥ एतद्विजानता सर्वं जगत्स्थावरजङ्गमम् । द्रष्टव्यमात्मवद्विष्णुर्यतोऽयं विश्वरूपधृक् ॥ विष्णुपु° I. 19. 46–48.

1443. मन एव मनुष्याणां कारणं बन्धमोक्षयोः । बन्धाय विषयासङ्गि मुक्त्यै निर्विषयं मनः ॥ विष्णुपु° VI. 7. 28.

1444. बुभुजे विषयान्कर्म चक्रे चानभिसंहितम् । विष्णु VI. 7. 105; 'तत्कर्म यन्न बन्धाय सा विद्या या विमुक्तये ।' विष्णुपु° I. 19. 41.

The date of the Viṣṇupurāṇa is a difficult question. There is no doubt that it is one of the early Purāṇas and that its text is not very much inflated. Hundreds of verses quoted in the three early digests viz. Kalpataru, Aparārka and Smṛticandrikā can be traced in the current text and this leads to the inference that the text has remained fixed for at least a thousand years. One important fact is that in this Purāṇa Vyāsa and the Sūta do not play a prominent part as in many other Purāṇas. It states as some other Purāṇas do, that Vyāsa had four pupils to whom he imparted the four Vedas and a fifth pupil the Sūta Romaharṣaṇa (III. chapters 3-7). But the sūta does not appear anywhere as the narrator of this Purāṇa. In the 4th aṁśa one remarkable matter is the mention of Śākya, Śuddhodana and Rāhula and it is stated that Śuddhodana was 23rd in descent from Bṛhad-bala of the Ikṣvāku line (chap. 22). The possibility of interpolations, particularly in the prose passages, would have to be admitted. Rāśis are referred to in III. 14. 5 (rāśiṣvarke ca gacchati) and the words lagna and horā also appear (in a prose passage). Vācaspati in his commentary on the Yogabhāṣya 2. 32 quotes it by name on *yamas* and *niyamas* (Viṣṇu VI. 7. 36–38) and a half verse 'evam bhadrāsanādīnām' etc., Viṣṇu VI. 7. 49 in com. on Yogabhāṣya III. 49. Vācaspati wrote his Nyāyasūcinibandha in *vatsara* 888 which should be taken as Vikrama year as he was a northerner and as the word 'vatsara' is used (and not śaka) i. e. 841 A. D.

The following may be read on this question. Wilson's Intro. to the translation of the Viṣṇu, vol. I. pp. LIX–LXXIII; H. 'date of Viṣṇupurāṇa' in ABORI vol. 18 pp. 265–275 and PRHR pp. 19–26 (puts if between 100–350 A. D.); Prof. Dikshitar in Pro. of the 13th Indian History Congress pp. 46–50; Jos. Abs in Festgabe Jacobi pp. 386–396 (on heterodox systems mentioned in different Purāṇas including the Viṣṇu). Vide above p. 869 for a Viṣṇupurāṇa of 23000 verses not utilized by the Dānasāgara. It would not be far from the truth to hold that the present Viṣṇu was composed between 300 to 500 A. D.

Viṣṇudharma-purāṇa— Vide pp. 873-876 above for discussion of the date assigned to it by Prof. Hazra. Shri Aśoka Chattarjee read a paper at the A. I. O. Con. at Delhi which has been published in ABORI vol. 38. 305–308, wherein he gives the date of composition of this Purāṇa as between 1250–1325 A.D. H. P. Sastri' Cat of Nepal Palm-leaf mss p. LIII says that a ms. of it was copied in

1047 A.D. Bühler in I. A. vol. 19 at p. 407 holds that this Purāṇa as well as the next were canonical acc. to Alberuni's pandits.

Viṣṇudharmottara (U. pub. by Veṅk. Press). It is a huge work and has been dealt with above (pp. 876-878). In spite of its huge size it is not quoted by the Kalpataru on vrata, tīrtha, brahmacārī, gṛhastha, rājadharma, mokṣa and other kāṇḍas. Aparārka quotes only 30 verses from it, of which 24 are on dāna: the Smṛticandrikā quotes about 30 in all and that Dānasāgara quotes profusely from it on dāna. It cannot be earlier than 600 A. D., and cannot be placed later than the 10th century, though parts of it may be later additions. Chapters 52–65 of the first section are called Śaṅkaragītā. The Kālikā Purāṇa expressly refers (in chap. 91. 70 and 92. 2) to the Viṣṇudharmottara as having been concerned with Rājanīti and Sadācāra.

Sāmbapurāṇa (U. pub. by Veṅk. Press). Vide H. in 'Sāmbapurāṇa through the ages' in JASB vol. 18 (1952) pp. 91–111, 'on Sāmba-purāṇa' a śaiva work in ABORI vol. 36 (1955) pp. 62–84 and 'Studies &c.' vol. I. pp. 32–108. This purāṇa is hardly ever quoted by early digests such as the Kalpataru, Aparārka or Smṛticandrikā. Only four verses from it are quoted by the Dānasāgara. Prof. Hazra's propositions that the Bhaviṣya (pp. 68–82) and Brahmapurāṇa (present) borrow from the Sāmba are not at all acceptable to the present author, particularly in view of his own admission (in 'Studies &c.' vol. I. p. 68) that the present Sāmbapurāṇa consists of different units belonging to different climes and ages. All that can be said positively is that a purāṇa called Sāmba is mentioned by Alberuni in 1030 A. D. (Sachau I. p. 130).

Śivapurāṇa (a Mahāpurāṇa according to some Purāṇas); Printed by Veṅk. Press in two volumes. Vide H. on 'Problems relating to Śivapurāṇa' in 'Our Heritage' (Calcutta 1953) vol. I. part 1 pp. 46–48. Dr. Pusalkar in 'Studies in Epics and Purāṇas pp. 31–41 (holds that the printed Vāyu is a genuine Mahāpurāṇa, that the Śivapurāṇa is a late work and is only an Upapurāṇa); the oldest datable reference to it is in Alberuni's work (vide Sachau, vol. 1. p. 131). It is quoted in the Dānasāgara several times, but is not quoted in Kalpataru, Aparārka and Sm. C. It is divided into seven saṁhitās called Vidyeśvara, Rudrasaṁhitā (in five parts called Sṛṣṭi, Satī, Pārvatī,[1444a] Kumāra, Yuddha),

1444 a. उमेति मात्रा तपसे निषिद्धा कालिका च सा। पश्चादुमाख्यां सुमुखी जगाम भुवने सुने॥ शिवपु० रुद्रसं० पार्वतीखण्ड 8. 17; compare 'उमेति ... जगाम' कुमारसम्भव I. 26;

(*Continued on next page*)

Śatarudra, Koṭirudra, Umā, Kailāsa, Vāyavīya (in two parts). It contains about 23000 verses. In Śatarudrasaṁ., chap. 42, the twelve jyotirliṅgas are mentioned, are spoken of as avatāras of Rudra and described; in Koṭirudrasaṁ., chap. 35 one thousand names of Śiva are set out; in Kailāsasaṁ., chap. 5 maṇḍala in pūjā is described; in chap. 7 verses 5–26 various Mudrās and Nyāsas are provided for; in the Rudrasaṁ. section, Pārvatī, there is a close resemblance between this purāṇa and the Kumārasaṁbhava as noted below.

Śivadharma. Vide H. in JGJRI vol. X. pp. 1–20; Aparārka p. 274 on Yāj. I. 193 quotes one verse from it which is a paraphrase of Yāj.

Saura (U.)—Vide H. in N. I. A. vol. VI. pp. 103–111 and 121–129, in B. V. vol. IV. pp. 212–216 and 'Studies &c.' vol. I. p. 348.

Skanda—This is the most extensive of Purāṇas and poses perplexing problems. It is found in two forms, one being divided into seven khaṇḍas, viz. Maheśvara, Vaiṣṇava, Brāhma, Kāśī, Āvantya, Nāgara and Prabhāsa, the other being divided into six saṁhitās, viz. Sanatkumāra, Sūta, Śāṅkarī, Vaiṣṇavī, Brāhmī and Saura. The Skanda in seven khaṇḍas has been published by the Veṅk. Press and the Sūtasaṁhitā with the commentary of Mādhavācārya has been published by the Anan. Press, Poona. The extent of the Skanda is variously given as 81000 ślokas, at 100000 ślokas (vide PRHR p. 158), at 86000 (in PRHR p. 159). The god Skanda does not figure prominently in this Purāṇa named after him. The Skanda is named in the Padma V. 59. 2. Skanda I. 2. 6. 79 is almost in the same words as Kirātārjunīya[1445] (II. 30 'sahasā vidadhīta na kriyām'). Skanda, Kāśīkhaṇḍa 24 (8 ff) is full of Śleṣa and Parisaṅkhyā in the style of Bāṇa as in 'yatra kṣa-

(*Continued from last page*)

वरेषु ये गुणाः प्रोक्ता नारीणां सुखदायकाः। तन्मध्ये हि विरूपाक्षे एकोऽपि न गुणः स्मृतः॥ पार्वतीखण्ड 27. 32. Compare वरेषु यद्बालमृगाक्षि...तदस्ति किं व्यस्तमपि त्रिलोचने॥ कुमार॰ V. 72; न केवलं भवेत्पापं निन्दां कर्तुः शिवस्य हि। यो वै शृणोति तन्निन्दां पापभाक् स भवेदिह॥ पार्वतीखण्ड 28. 37; compare न केवलं यो महतो...स पापभाक्॥ कुमार॰ V. 83; अद्यप्रभृति ते दासस्तपोभिः क्रीत एव ते। पार्वतीखण्ड 28. 44; compare कुमार॰ V. 86. There are several other close parallels, which are not set out for reasons of space.

1445. सहसा न क्रियां कुर्यात्पदमेतन्महापदाम्। विमृश्यकारिणं धीरं वृणते सर्वसम्पदः॥ स्कन्द I. 2. 6. 79.

paṇakā eva dṛśyante maladhāriṇaḥ' (verse 21) or 'vibhramo yatra nārīṣu na vidvatsu ca karhicit' (verse 9). Nāṭyaveda and Arthaśāstras are mentioned in Kāśīkhaṇḍa (Pūrvārdha 7. 4–5), Dhanvantari and Caraka on medicine are mentioned in Kāśīkhaṇḍa (Pūrvārdha 1.71); the word Jhoṭiṅga occurs in Kāśīkhaṇḍa 72. 74 (Jhotiṅgā rākṣasāḥ krūrāḥ). Skanda is quoted on topics of Dharmaśāstra in early commentaries and digests. The Mit. on Yāj. II. 290 mentions it in connection with the status of veśyās (courtezans). Kalpataru on vrata quotes only 15 verses from it, Kalpataru on tīrtha (pp. 36–39, 32, 46, 130–135) quotes 92 verses from it, on dāna only 44, on niyatakāla 63 verses, 18 verses on Rājadharma (on Kaumudīmahotsava), only 4 in śrāddhakāṇḍa and 3 in gṛhasthakāṇḍa. Aparārka[1446] quotes only 19 verses from it; one quotation indicates Tāntrik influence (vide note). The Dānasāgara cites 48 verses on dāna from it and the Sm. C. only 23 in all. Considering the colossal figure of ślokas in the Skanda it must be said that it is rather sparingly quoted in the Dharmaśāstra works. A verse in it seems to echo the very words of Kālidāsa and quotes the view of Devala.[1446a] In such a huge work interpolations could easily be made. So it is difficult to assign a definite date to it. A ms. of the Skanda in the Nepal Durbar Library is written in characters which belong to the 7th century A. D. according to Haraprasad Shastri (vide Cat. of Nepal Palm-leaf mss. p. LII.)

It would be not far from the truth to say that the Skanda cannot be placed earlier than the 7th century A. D. and not later than 9th century A. D. on the evidence so far available.

1446. स्कन्दपुराण is quoted by अपरार्क p. 295 on या. I. 204 on the gift of a cow. After citing five verses and a half a prose mantra is quoted as follows: ओं ह्रीं नमो भगवति ब्रह्ममातर्विष्णुभगिनि रुद्रदेवते सर्वपापविमोचिनि स्वरूपं स्मर हूं हे ब्रह्मास्ते हव्ये चाग्ने धृतिमति सरस्वति सुश्रुते एह्येहि हुंकरु हुंकुरु सर्वलोकमये एह्यागच्छागच्छ स्वाहा । इति धेनुकर्णजपः ।'.

1446 a. मरणं प्रकृतिश्चैव जीवितं विकृतिर्यदा । स्कन्द I. 2. 10. 27; compare मरणं प्रकृतिः शरीरिणां विकृतिर्जीवितमुच्यते बुधैः ॥ रघुवंश VIII. 87; त्रीणि ज्योतींषि पुरुष इति वै देवलोऽब्रवीत् । भार्या कर्म च विद्या च संसाध्यं यत्नतस्त्रयम् । स्कन्द I. 2. 15. 10.

SECTION V

CHAPTER XXIV

Influence of Purāṇas on Dharmaśāstra

Literary works and society act and re-act on each other. The state of Indian society a few centuries before and after Christ, riven as it was by the growing strength and onslaught of Buddhism, Jainism and other dissenting sects and disturbed by invasions of the Greeks, Śakas, Pahlavas, Hūṇas and other foreign tribes, gave much food for thought to those who were devoted to the Vedic religion and induced them to write works setting forth new ideologies and practices and effecting a re-statement of the ancient Vedic and Smṛti religion. When these works attained a position of authority and eminence, the endeavour of the followers of the Veda was to follow them as far as possible and to adapt their practices and religious rites to the requirements of the Purāṇas. We have to see how the Purāṇas set about their task of re-orientation. We must note that current Hindu religious practices, judging from the *saṅkalpa* made at the beginning of every rite, are meant to confer upon the performer the rewards declared by Śruti (Veda), Smṛti and Purāṇas (Śruti-smṛti-purāṇokta-phalaprāptyartham). The task was two-fold, viz. (1) to undermine the power and prestige of Buddhism and Jainism and the influence of the numerous philosophical[1447] schools that had sprung up and (2) to wean away large sections of the masses from the attractive features of Buddhism and to convince them that they could secure in the re-orientated Hindu faith the same benefits, social and spiritual, as Buddhism promised and that the religious principles of the followers of Veda coincided with many of the teachings of Buddhism and were borrowed by Buddhism from Vedic practices. Ultimately Buddhism vanished from the land of its origin. The main causes of this disappearance of Buddhism from Bhārata will be stated at the end of this section, but this much may be said here at once that the Purāṇas played a substantial role in bring-

1447. It is stated in the Mahāvagga (part of Suttanipāta) that there were 63 philosophical schools at the time of Buddha (vide SBE vol. X, part 2 p. 92).

ing about the decline and disappearance of Buddhism by emphasizing and assimilating some of the principles and doctrines of Buddha[1448] such as ahiṁsā, by accepting Buddha himself as an avatāra of Viṣṇu, by adopting vegetarianism as a high form of austerity, by making use of monasteries and asceticism as stated in such smṛtis as those of Manu and Yāj.

The Purāṇas set about their task by saying that for the proper understanding of the Veda, knowledge of Itihāsa and Purāṇa was essential. A famous verse says[1449] 'one should strengthen the Veda by (the study and application of) Itihāsa and Purāṇa; the Veda is afraid of the person of little learning (with the thought) that he (the man of small learning) may harm it'. Manu states[1450] that those brāhmaṇas that have learnt according to the rules (of Veda study) the Veda together with the works that strengthen it are to be understood as *śiṣṭas* and are instrumental in making (the meaning of) the Veda clearly perceptible. The Vāyu[1451] emphasizes in this connection that that brāhmaṇa who knows the four Vedas together with (the six) ancillary lores and the Upaniṣads would not be a wise man if he did not know Purāṇas. The Upaniṣads drop brief hints about the creation of *ākāśa* from the one *brahma* (in Tai. Up. II. 1), of *tejas* (Chān. Up. VI. 2. 3), of waters (Chān. Up. VI. 2. 4). The Purāṇas explain at great length the creation and dissolution of the elements (in the order reverse of that of creation) e g. Vāyu 4. 17 ff, Brahma 1-3, Agni 17, Brahmāṇḍa II. 3 ff, Kūrma I. 2, 4, 7, 8 &c. The stories of Hariścandra and

---

1448. Pargiter (in 'Puarāṇa texts of the Dynasties of the Kali age' p. XVIII footnote) thinks that it was largely through the Paurāṇika Literature that Hinduism secured its revival and the downfall of Buddhism.

1449. इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदं समुपबृंहयेत्। बिभेत्यल्पश्रुताद्वेदो मामयं प्रहरिष्यति॥ आदिपर्व I. 267-268, वायु 1. 201, पद्म V. 2. 51-52, ब्रह्माण्ड I. 1. 171, वसिष्ठधर्मसूत्र 27. 6, लघुव्याससमृति II. 86, वृद्धात्रि chap. 3 p. 50 in Jivananda's edition (reads प्रतरिष्यति). The स्मृतिच. (I. p. 3) ascribes this verse to बृहस्पति. The प्रायश्चित्ततत्त्व p. 511 quotes it from वसिष्ठ. The कूर्म I. 2. 19 reads 'इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदार्थानुपबृंहयेत्'. रामानुज in his भाष्य on ब्रह्मसूत्र (p. 72 B. S. S.) quotes this verse and reads प्रतरिष्यति.

1450. धर्मेणाधिगतो यैस्तु वेदः सपरिबृंहणः। ते शिष्टा ब्राह्मणा ज्ञेयाः श्रुतिप्रत्यक्षहेतवः॥ मनु XII. 109.

1451. यो विद्याच्चतुरो वेदान्साङ्गोपनिषदो द्विजः। न चेत्पुराणं संविद्यान्नैव स स्याद्विचक्षणः॥ वायु I. 200, स्कन्द, प्रभासखण्ड 2. 93, पद्म V. 2. 50-51 (reads the second half as 'पुराणं च विजानाति यः स तस्माद्विचक्षणः।'. ब्रह्माण्ड I. 1. 170 has the first half.

Naciketas that occur in the Ait. Br. and the Kaṭhopaniṣad are explained at length in Brahmapurāṇa (chap. 104 and 150 about Hariścandra), in Sabhāparva chap. 12 (for Hariścandra) and in Anuśāsana chap. 91 (for Naciketas). The famous dialogue of Yama and Yamī (Ṛg. X. 10) is expanded in the Narasiṁha-purāṇa (chap. 13. 6–36). The Viṣṇupurāṇa[1452] (IV. 6. 34 ff) sets out the story of Purūravas and Urvaśī, refers to the hymn in the Ṛg. X. 95 for that story and quotes the first verse of the hymn in a somewhat corrupt form.

But the claims of the extant Purāṇas go far beyond the above viz. as strengtheners of the Veda. The Kūrma[1453] states: '(put) on one side all the Purāṇas together with Itihāsa (Mahābhārata) and on another the highest Veda; it is this (Purāṇas) that surpasses (the other viz. Veda)'. The Mahābhārata also makes a similar claim. The Purāṇas appear to claim priority (and even equality) with the Veda. In note 1349 passages from the Matsya and other Purāṇas have been cited, stating that Brahmā first thought of the Purāṇas before all other śāstras and then the Vedas sprang forth from his lips. Several Purāṇas are spoken of as equal to the Veda (Vedasammita) as in[1454] Vāyu I. 11, 4. 12, Brahma 1. 29, 245. 4 and 21, Viṣṇu I. 1. 13, VI. 8. 12, Padma VI. 282. 116. Further, several Purāṇas claim to have been delivered by some God such as Brahmā (Brahmapurāṇa I. 30) or by the Wind-god (Vāyu I. 196)[1455] or by the avatāras of Viṣṇu as in the case of Matsya-purāṇa (I. 26) or Varāha (2. 1–3). The japa of Vedic texts was deemed to destroy all sins as shown in H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 45–50. The Purāṇas also say that reading the Purāṇas or listening to a recitation of them

---

1452. विष्णुपुराण IV. 6. 64 in prose runs : ततश्चोन्मत्तरूपो जाये हे तिष्ठ मनसि घोरे तिष्ठ वचसि कपटिके तिष्ठेत्येवमनेकप्रकारं सूक्तमवोचत् ।. Compare ऋग्वेद X. 95. 1 ' हये जाये मनसा तिष्ठ घोरे वचांसि मिश्रा कृणवावहै नु ।'.

1453. एकतस्तु पुराणानि सेतिहासानि ... रिच्यते ॥ कूर्म II. 46.129 (q. in note 1402 above). एकतश्चतुरो वेदा भारतं चैतदेकतः । पुरा किल सुरैः सर्वैः समेत्य तुलया धृतम् । चतुर्भ्यः सरहस्येभ्यो वेदेभ्यो ह्यधिकं यदा । तदाप्रभृति लोकेस्मिन्महाभारतमुच्यते । आदिपर्व 1. 271–273.

1454. पुराणं संप्रवक्ष्यामि ब्रह्मोक्तं वेदसंमितम् । वायु 1. 11; गुरुं प्रणम्य वक्ष्यामि पुराणं वेदसंमितम् । ब्रह्म 1. 29; पुराणं नारदोपाख्यमेतद्वेदार्थसंमितम् । नारदीय I. 1. 36.

1455. Vāyu (103. 58–66) narrates how from Brahmā the purāṇa came to Vāyu and how through a succession of about 30 teachers it came down to Dvaipāyana and lastly to Sūta.

would destroy all sins.[1456] Vide Vāyu 103. 58, Brahma 175. 89–90, Matsya 290. 20, 291. 29 and 31, Viṣṇu VI. 8. 3, 12. Some of the Purāṇas indulge in extravagant praise of themselves, e. g. the Varāha-purāṇa (217. 12–13, 217. 15–16) states that reading ten chapters of that Purāṇa confers the merit secured by the performance of Agniṣṭoma and Atirātra sacrifices. Vide Brahma 254. 34–35, Agni 384. 13–30, Devī-Bhāgavata XII. 13. 11–17 in a similar strain. Moreover, the Purāṇas dwell upon the superior value and efficacy, as compared with the Vedic sacrifices, of some of the institutions on which they lay emphasis, such as pilgrimages,[1457] vratas, *bhakti*. The Padma states (I. 38. 2 and 18) that by merely going to Gayā or by taking a bath in the Phalgu river one secures the reward that the performance of Aśvamedha confers. The Skanda proclaims[1458] 'I have no use for sacrificial rites that are declared by the Veda, that have no life in them, that are within the domain of ignorance and that entail injury (to animals). If (a sacrifice) is performed with such inanimate things as fuel-sticks, flowers and kuśa grass, the result must be similar (inanimate), since the effect is like the cause'. Vide Śāntiparva 337 for a story on the discussion between sages and gods about offering in sacrifices merely products of grains or goat-flesh. Offerings of flesh in sacrifices to gods were made in the Ṛgvedic period. But even in the Ṛgveda there are a few verses that indicate that offerings of ghee and fuel-sticks were declared to be able to win the favour of gods as much as animal sacrifices might do. 'Whoever[1459] offers to (or worships) Agni with a fuel-stick or with an oblation of ghee or

---

1456. सर्वपापहरं पुण्यं पवित्रं च यशस्वि च । ब्रह्मा ददौ शास्त्रमिदं पुराणं मातरिश्वने ॥ वायु 103. 58; पुराणसंहिता चेयं तव भूप मयोदिता । सर्वपापहरा नित्यमारोग्यश्रीफलप्रदा ॥ मत्स्य 290. 20; पुराणं वैष्णवं चैतत्सर्वकिल्बिषनाशनम् । विशिष्टं सर्वशास्त्रेभ्यः पुरुषार्थोपपादकम् ॥ एतत्ते यन्मयाख्यातं पुराणं वेदसंमतम् (संमितम् ?) । श्रुतेऽस्मिन् सर्वदोषोत्थः पापराशिः प्रणश्यति ॥ विष्णु. VI. 1. 8. 3 and 12.

1457. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 561–564 for superiority of tīrthas to solemn Vedic sacrifices and pp. 43–45 above for the eulogy of *vratas*. The efficacy of *bhakti* (loving faith in God) will be dealt with later on in this section.

1458. अविद्यान्तर्गतैर्यज्ञकर्मभिर्न प्रयोजनम् । मम हिंसात्मकैरस्ति निगमोक्तैरचेतनैः ॥ समित्पुष्पकुशाद्यैः साधनैर्यश्चेतनैः । क्रियते तत्तथा भावि कार्यं कारणवन्नृणाम् ॥ स्कन्द I. 2. 13. 59–60.

1459. यः समिधा य आहुती यो वेदेन ददाश मर्तो अग्नये । यो नमसा स्वध्वरः ॥ तस्येदर्वन्तो रंहयन्त आशवस्तस्य द्युम्नितमं यशः । न तमंहो देवकृतं कुतश्चन न मर्त्यकृतं नशत् ॥ ऋ. VIII. 19. 5–6.

with (the study of) the Veda or who performs a good sacrifice with prostrations, for him alone run fleet horses and his is most brilliant fame; and no evil whether brought about by gods or by men might reach him from any side'. Another mantra[1460] says 'O Agni! we bring to you an offering accompanied by a ṛkmantra fashioned (or produced) by our heart. May those mantras be oxen, bulls and cows from you'.

The Purāṇas only pursue an attitude to Veda and sacrifices that is found in some of the Upaniṣads. The Muṇḍakopaniṣad[1461] says: 'one should know two vidyās (lores), *parā* (the higher) and *aparā* (the lower); the latter comprehends the four Vedas and Phonetics, aphorisms about solemn sacrifices, grammar, Nirukta (derivation of words), metres, astronomy; while the highest lore is that whereby the Imperishable (Reality) is known'. The same Upaniṣad condemns aparā-vidyā when it says 'These sacrifices are infirm (leaky) boats constituted by eighteen (persons) depending on which are declared actions that are inferior; those foolish people who welcome these actions as the highest good become subject again to old age and death'. The Kaṭhopaniṣad[1462] states that what are known as *avidyā* and *vidyā* are far apart from each other, are contradictory and lead to different results. When Nārada approached Sanatkumāra and requested the latter to teach him, the latter said to him 'tell me what you know and then I shall tell you what is beyond that.' Then Nārada stated that he knew all the four Vedas, Itihāsa-purāṇa the fifth Veda and several other lores, whereupon Sanat-kumāra told him that the four Vedas and the other lores he had learned were merely a name and then he led Nārada gradually to the understanding of the Highest Self. The Bṛ. Up. I. 4. 10 condemns him, who worships a deity thinking he is different from the *devatā*, that he does not know the truth, that he is like a (sacrificial) animal to the gods. Similarly, in

---

1460. आ ते अग्न ऋचा हविर्हृदा तष्टं भरामसि। ते ते भवन्तूक्षण ऋषभासो वशा उत॥ ऋ. VI. 16. 47.

1461. द्वे विद्ये वेदितव्ये इति ह स्म यद् ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति परा चैवापरा च। तत्रापरा ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोऽथर्ववेदः शिक्षा कल्पो व्याकरणं निरुक्तं छन्दो ज्योतिषमिति। अथ परा यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते॥ मुण्डकोप० I. 1. 4–5; प्लवा ह्येते अदृढा यज्ञरूपा अष्टादशोक्तमवरं येषु कर्म। एतच्छ्रेयो येऽभिनन्दन्ति मूढा जरामृत्युं ते पुनरेवापियन्ति॥ मुण्डकोप० I. 2. 7. The 18 are the 16 priests, the sacrificer and his wife. In his भाष्य on Vedāntasūtra I. 2. 21 Śaṅkarācārya holds that this verse is part of the condemnation of *aparā vidyā*.

1462. दूरमेते विपरीते विषूची अविद्या या च विद्येति ज्ञाता। कठोप. I. 2. 4.

several passages of the Upaniṣads austerities, liberality, straightforwardness, ahiṁsā and truthfulness are put forward as equal to or superior to the actual performance of the ceremonial of sacrifice (*yajna*); vide Chāndogya III. 17. 4, Praśna I. 15, Muṇḍaka I. 2. 11.

Though in a few passages of the Upaniṣads the knowledge of the Highest Self is put higher than the four Vedas, the Upaniṣads generally treat the Vedas as authoritative and quote Vedic verses in support of their statements. For example, the Ait. Up. II. 5 quotes Ṛgveda IV. 27. 1 (taduktam-ṛṣiṇā-Garbhe nu &c.), Praśnop. I. 11 quotes Ṛg. I. 164. 12 (pañcapādam pitaram), Bṛ. Up. II. 5. 15, 17 and 19 quote respectively Ṛg. I. 116. 12, I. 117. 22, VI. 47. 18 (rūpam rūpam pratirūpo). The Upaniṣads further emphasize[1463] that brahmavidyā is to be imparted only to those who are *śrotriya* (who have studied the Veda), who engage in their duties and who have properly performed Śirovrata. The Bṛ.[1464] Up. shows that Veda study, sacrifices, charity &c. are preparations for the knowledge of *brahma*: 'Brāhmaṇas (and others) desire to know this (great Self) by study of the Veda, by sacrifices, gifts, *tapas*, fasting'. These passages make it clear that study of the Veda and performance of sacrifices enjoined by it are accepted by the Upaniṣads as preparatory and as cleansing the mind of its lower passions and as making a person worthy of receiving the knowledge of the highest truth about the One Supreme Spirit and that the Upaniṣads do not altogether condemn and give up the Vedas and sacrifices.

The Purāṇas adopt, in spite of the claims made by them here and there about their priority to the Vedas, about their own value and efficacy, the same attitude towards the Veda as the Upaniṣads do. They treat the Vedas as authoritative and enjoin

---

1463. तदेतदृचाभ्युक्तम् । क्रियावन्तः श्रोत्रिया ब्रह्मनिष्ठाः स्वयं जुह्वत एकर्षिं श्रद्धयन्तः । तेषामेवैतां ब्रह्मविद्यां वदेत शिरोव्रतं विधिवद्यैस्तु चीर्णम् ॥ मुण्डकोप० III 2. 10. शिरोव्रत is carrying fire on the head (according to Ātharvaṇa rules). The देवीभागवत (XI. 9. 12–13) remarks 'अग्निरित्यादिभिर्मन्त्रैः षड्भिः शुद्धेन भस्मना । सर्वाङ्गोद्धूलनं कुर्यात् शिरोव्रतसमाह्वयम् ॥ ""यावद्विद्योदयस्तावत्तस्य त्रिधा खलूत्तमा ॥'. The six अथर्वशिरस् mantras are : अग्निरिति भस्म, वायुरिति भस्म, जलमिति भस्म, स्थलमिति भस्म, व्योमेति भस्म, सर्वं ह वा इदं भस्म '.

1464. तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसाऽनाशकेन । बृह. उप. IV. 4. 22; vide गीता 18. 5 यज्ञदानतपःकर्म न त्याज्यं कार्यमेव तत् । यज्ञो दानं तपश्चैव पावनानि मनीषिणाम् ॥.

the employment of Vedic mantras in many rites. The author contributed a paper to the Dr. Kunhan Raja Presentation volume pp. 5–8 on the 'Vedic mantras and legends employed in Purāṇas' citing illustrations from the Brahmapurāṇa. A few illustrations from other Purāṇas may be set out here. The Matsyapurāṇa (chap. 93) when describing the procedure of the *homa* to the nine planets prescribes nine Vedic mantras, five of which are different from those provided by Yāj. (I. 300–301). Vide p. 750 above for a comparative table of the two sets of mantras. In the Udvāhatattva[1465] Raghunandana remarks that the mantras 'ā kṛṣṇena' and others are common to persons following the four Vedas and that Bhavadevabhaṭṭa held the same view. Matsya prescribes that when inauspicious birds (like an owl) or animals cry near a house or enter it, a homa should be performed, or five brāhmaṇas should engage in a *japa*[1466] of the hymn beginning with 'Devāḥ kapota' (Ṛg. X. 165. 1–5). In describing the whole procedure of the establishment of images of gods or the *liṅga* (of Śiva), the Matsya (chapter 265) prescribes numerous Vedic verses and hymns for the different parts of the ceremony. For example, for bringing about the purification of the image four mantras are prescribed viz. Ṛg. VII. 49. 1–3 and X. 9. 1; in providing for the placing of a jar full of water near the head of the bed on which the image is to be placed, two mantras 'Āpo devī' (Vāj. S. 12. 35, Tai. S. IV. 2. 32) and 'āpo asmān mātaraḥ' (Ṛg. X. 17. 10) are to be recited. Matsya (265. 24–29) prescribes for the japa of several *sūktas* (hymns) by four door-keepers learned in the Vedas that are to stand in the four main directions. The Agnipurāṇa (41. 6–8) providing for the laying down of baked bricks or stones in building a temple prescribes the recital of many Vedic mantras, viz. Ṛg. X. 9. 1–3, Ṛg. X. 9. 4, Ṛg. IX. 58. 1–4, Pāvamānī verses (either Ṛg. IX. 1. 1–10 or verses from Ṛg. IX), Ṛg. I. 24. 15, Ṛg. IV. 31. 1, Vāj. S. IV. 36 (Varuṇasya), Ṛg. IV. 40. 5 and the Śrīsūkta (of 29 verses

---

1465. ग्रहहोमे तु आ कृष्णेनेत्यादिमन्त्राः सर्ववेदसाधारणाः पुराणोक्तत्वात्। तथा च मत्स्यपुराणम्। आ कृष्णेनेति सूर्याय होमः कार्यो द्विजन्मना। ...केतुं कृण्वन्निति कुर्यात् केतूनामुपशान्तये॥ अत एव भवदेवभट्टेनापि तथा लिखितम्॥ उद्वाहतत्त्व (Jiv. II. p. 126). The मत्स्यपुराण verses quoted are 93. 33–37. The mantras are taken from the Ṛgveda, Tai. S., Vāj. S. What रघुनन्दन emphasizes is that whatever Veda may be studied by a man and his family, he has to employ the mantras specified by Matsya when he performs a *grahahoma*.

1466. मृगपक्षिविकारेषु कुर्याद्धोमं सदक्षिणम्। देवाः कपोत इति वा जप्तव्याः पञ्चभिर्द्विजैः॥ मत्स्य 237. 13.

beginning with 'Hiraṇyavarṇām hariṇīm'). The Nāradīya-purāṇa (II. 73. 83-90) contains at end of each of the verses parts of vedic prayer, which occur in Ṛg. VII. 66. 16, Tai. Ār. IV. 4. 2-5 and Vāj. S. 36. 24; Bhāgavata I. 2. 21 (*bhidyate* &c.) is taken from Muṇḍaka Up. II. 2. 8.

The Purāṇas not only prescribe Vedic mantras for various purposes, but suggest the employment of numerous Paurāṇika mantras. It appears that Paurāṇika mantras came to be employed along with Vedic mantras in religious rites even of Brāhmaṇas at the beginning of the Christian era or within a few centuries after Christ. Yāj. I. 229 prescribes that the Viśve Devas should be invited to come to a śrāddha with the ṛk, 'O Viśve-Devas! Come, listen to this my call, sit down on these *kuśas*' (Ṛg. II. 41. 13). On this the Mitākṣarā (about 1100 A. D.) remarks that along with the Vedic *mantra* mentioned by Yāj. a smārta mantra should also be employed viz. the mantra[1467] 'āgacchantu mahābhāgā,' which occurs in Skanda and Garuḍa-purāṇa. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. p. 440 note 984 for the ascription of this verse to various authorities. The Vāyupurāṇa[1468] prescribes that the mantra 'adoration to the *devatās*, to *pitṛs*, to the great Yogins, to *svadhā* and *svāhā*; they are always present' should be recited thrice at the beginning and at the end of śrāddha and at the time of offering *piṇḍas*; the pitṛs quickly come when the mantra is repeated and goblins run away; this mantra protects the pitṛs in all three worlds'. This mantra is styled 'Saptārcis' (having seven flames) in Vāyu 74. 20, Brahmāṇḍa III. 11. 30 and in Viṣṇudharmottara I. 140. 68 and by Hemādri on śrāddha pp. 1079 and 1208, who notes that it occurs in seven Purāṇas. In chap. 206 of the Agni in the procedure of offering *arghya* to the star Agastya (Canopus) Ṛg. I. 179. 6 has been adopted as verse 13.

1467. The मन्त्र is: आगच्छन्तु महाभागा विश्वेदेवा महाबलाः । ये यत्र विहिताः श्राद्धे सावधाना भवन्तु ते ॥. This is गरुडपुराण I. 218. 7, but q. by अपरार्क on p. 478 from बृहस्पति and on p. 481 from ब्रह्मपुराण.

1468. The mantra is: देवताभ्यः पितृभ्यश्च महायोगिभ्य एव च । नमः स्वधायै स्वाहायै नित्यमेव भवन्त्युत ॥ वायु 74. 15-16. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 458-459 note 1020 for all the verses in relation to this mantra and the purāṇas where they occur. In the printed ब्रह्माण्ड III. 11. 17-18 the मन्त्र is देवताभ्यः...एव च । नमः स्वाहायै स्वधायै नित्यमेव भवन्त्युत. Some read नित्यमेव नमो नमः. The मिता. on या. I. 121 says that this mantra should be employed by śūdras in all the five daily sacrifices according to some, while others said that the śūdra was only to utter the word नमः.

Not only are mantras from Vedic Saṁhitās prescribed by the Purāṇas for certain rites, but Upaniṣad passages also sometimes with slight variance are bodily transferred into some of the Purāṇas. For example, Kūrma II. 9. 12, 13 and 18 embody Tai. Up. II. 4 (yato vāco nivartante), Śvetāśvataropa. III. 8 (vedāham-etam puruṣam) and VI. 11 'eko devaḥ'. The Viṣṇupurāṇa VI. 5. 65 is 'dve vidye veditavye iti cātharvaṇī śrutiḥ' and contains a passage of the Muṇḍaka Up. I.1.4 (vide note 1461 above). The Vāyu 20. 5 (praṇavo dhanuḥ) and 20. 28 (Ajām-ekām) are respectively Muṇḍakopa. II, 2. 4 and Śvetāśvatara-up. IV. 5. Vāyu 14. 13 (sarvataḥ pāṇipādāntam) is almost the same as Śvetāśvatara Up. III. 16 and Vāmana 47. 64–65 has the same verse. Vāmana 47. 67 is almost the same as Ṛg. I. 10. 1.

This gives rise to interesting questions. The śūdras had no right to study the Veda. But as a matter of fact the Purāṇas contain as exemplified above a good many Vedic mantras. It is stated in the Bhāgavata[1468a] 'women, śūdras and brāhmaṇas in name only are beyond the pale of the three Vedas; therefore the sage (Vyāsa) composed through compassion for them the Bhārata tale'. The Devībhāgavata states 'study of the Veda

---

1468 a. स्त्रीशूद्रद्विजबन्धूनां त्रयी न श्रुतिगोचरा। ...तस्माद्भारतमाख्यानं कृपया मुनिना कृतम्॥ भागवत I. 4. 25 q. by परिभाषाप्रकाश p. 37, which remarks 'वेदकार्यकारित्वावगमाद्भारतस्य वेदकार्यात्मज्ञानकारित्वसिद्धिः'. स्त्रीशूद्रद्विजबन्धूनां न वेदश्रवणं मतम्। तेषामेव हितार्थाय पुराणानि कृतानि च। देवीभागवत I. 3. 21. शङ्कराचार्य is careful to point out on Vedāntasūtra I. 3. 38 that śūdras have no *adhikāra* for brahmavidyā based on the study of the Veda. But he does not deny to the śūdras the knowledge of the Self altogether. He refers to the instances of Vidura and Dharmavyādha that were possessed of the knowledge of *brahma* due to the effects of their former lives, states that they would secure the result of brahmajñāna (viz. mokṣa, final liberation from *saṁsāra*), that śūdras have the right to learn from the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas as stated in 'he should read to the four varṇas' and that in that way they might secure knowledge of brahma and mokṣa. "येषां पुनः पूर्वकृतसंस्कारवशाद्विदुरधर्मव्याधप्रभृतीनां ज्ञानोत्पत्तिस्तेषां न शक्यते फलप्राप्तिः प्रतिषेद्धुं ज्ञानस्यैकान्तिकफलत्वात्। 'श्रावयेच्चतुरो वर्णान्' इति चेतिहासपुराणाधिगमे चातुर्वर्ण्यस्याधिकारस्मरणात्। वेदपूर्वकस्तु नास्त्यधिकारः शूद्राणामिति स्थितम्॥ भाष्य on वे. सू. I. 3. 38. On वे. सू. III, 4. 36 शङ्कराचार्य refers to the woman वाचक्नवी as one who had the knowledge of brahma 'रैक्व-वाचक्नवीप्रभृतीनामेवंभूतानामपि ब्रह्मवित्त्वश्रुत्युपलब्धेः'. गार्गी वाचक्नवी figures as a great seeker after *brahma* in the Bṛ. Up. III. 6. 1, III. 8. 1 and 12. The महाभारत says that what it dilates upon as to the पुरुषार्थs, धर्म, अर्थ, काम and मोक्ष, is found elsewhere and that what it does not contain on those subjects can be found nowhere else and that the Mahābhārata should be listened to by him who desires mokṣa, by brāhmaṇas, kings and pregnant women (Svargārohaṇaparva 5. 50–51).

is not accepted for women, śūdras and brāhmaṇas in name only and Purāṇas are compiled for the purpose of benefitting them'. From this it follows that in the case of śūdras the listening to the Bhārata was deemed to bring about the same results that the Veda does for *dvijas* and that even the śūdra may acquire the knowledge of the Self (and mokṣa) from the Bhārata.

Though the brāhmaṇas in the 5th and following centuries A. D. wanted to placate the śūdras who were probably a majority of the whole people and to wean them away from Buddhism, they still kept a distinction between *dvijas* and *śūdras* and the only concessions made were that the śūdras could worship in the same way as dvijas did and that they could have mantras (Paurāṇika) in their rites and ceremonies. For example, in allowing *bhasma-snāna* (smearing ashes on the body) the Padma (IV. 110. 286–289) provides Vedic mantras for men of the three varṇas but Paurāṇika mantras only (Padma IV. 110. 290–293) for śūdras. The Padma[1469] further provides that śūdras could not perform prāṇāyāma or utter the sacred syllable 'om' but that they should substitute *dhyāna* in place of prāṇāyāma and 'Śiva' in place of 'om'.

Gradually in some matters the procedure provided in the Purāṇas came to supersede the ancient Vedic procedure prescribed for them. Aparārka states (on p. 14) that in Devapūjā one should follow the procedure prescribed in the Narasiṁhapurāṇa[1470] and the like and not the procedure of the Pāśupatas or Pāñcarātras and (on p. 15) he says the same about the consecration of temples,[1471] images and the like.

The Narasiṁhapurāṇa (chap. 63. 5–6) says that the mantra 'om namo Nārāyaṇāya' enables one to secure all objects and *japa* of it frees a man from all sins and leads him to absorption into Viṣṇu.[1472]

1469. प्राणायामश्च प्रणवः शूद्रेषु न विधीयते। प्राणायामपदे ध्यानं शिवेत्योङ्कारवर्णनम्॥ पद्म IV. 110. 316.

1470. नरसिंहपु॰ chap. 62 deals with the procedure of विष्णुपूजा.

1471. एवं प्रतिष्ठायामपि पुराणाद्युक्तैवेतिकर्तव्यता ग्राह्या नान्या। तेषामेव व्यामिश्रधर्मप्रमाणत्वेन भविष्यपुराणे परिज्ञातत्वात्। अपरार्क p. 15.

1472. किं तस्य बहुभिर्मन्त्रैः किं तस्य बहुभिर्व्रतैः। ओं नमो नारायणेति मन्त्रः सर्वार्थसाधकः॥ इमं मन्त्रं जपेद्यस्तु शुचिर्भूत्वा समाहितः। सर्वपापविनिर्मुक्तो विष्णुसायुज्यमाप्नुयात्॥ नरसिंहपु॰ 63. 6–7; किं तस्य बहुभिर्मन्त्रैर्भक्तिर्यस्य जनार्दने। नमो नारायणायेति मन्त्रः सर्वार्थसाधकः। विष्णुर्येषां जयस्तेषां कुतस्तेषां पराजयः। येषामिन्दीवरश्यामो हृदयस्थो जनार्दनः॥ वामनपु॰ 94. 58–59; the मत्स्य says 'ओं नमो नारायणेति मूलमन्त्र उदाहृतः।'.

The Agnipurāṇa (chap. 218) describes the procedure of the king's coronation and (chapter 219) sets out the Paurāṇika mantras (about 70) employed at the coronation. Similarly, the Viṣṇudharmottara (II. 21) describes the procedure of coronation with Vedic mantras and (in II. 22) with 184 Paurāṇika verses invoking various gods, minor deities, sages, rivers &c. Medieval digests like the Rājanītiprakāśa (pp. 49–83), Nītimayūkha (pp. 1–4), Rājadharmakaustubha (pp. 318-363) describe the combined coronation procedure of Vedic and Paurāṇika mantras from the Visnu-dharmottara (vide pp. 78–79 of the H. of Dh. vol. III. for details). The Rājanītiprakāśa (pp. 430–433) prescribes numerous mantras derived from the Viṣṇudharmottara as prayers and as blessings.

The Padmapurāṇa[1473] narrates the interesting story of a person called Dhanaśarmā whose father followed only the Vedic path (śrauta-mārga), who did not engage in such Paurāṇika prescriptions as Vaiśākhasnāna and who therefore became a horrible and distressed *preta*. Some of the verses are very interesting. 'I performed in my ignorance only Vedic rites and I never observed *Vaiśākhasnāna* in honour of God Mādhava (Visnu), nor observed a single Vaiśākha *Full Moon* vrata which is like an axe for cutting the tree of sins that afflicts one like a conflagration fed by the fuel of sinful deeds &c.; to one who studies many śāstras and several Vedas with their extensive ancillary Literature, learning does not come, if he has not studied Purāṇas'. This shows what importance came to be attached to Purāṇas not only for śūdras but even for brāhmaṇas who performed the Vedic rites prescribed for them.

The influence of the Purāṇas went on increasing gradually. At first it was said[1474] that the dharma understood from the Veda was the highest, while the dharma declared in the Purāṇas

---

1473. मया केवलमेवैकश्रौतमार्गानुसारिणा । उद्दिश्य माधवं देवं न स्नातं मासि माधवे ॥ वैदिकं केवलं कर्म कृतमज्ञानतो मया । पापेन्धनदवज्वालापापद्रुमकुठारिका ॥ कृता नैकापि वैशाखी विधिना वत्स पूर्णिमा । अव्रता यस्य वैशाखी सोऽवैशाखो भवेन्नरः । दश जन्मानि च स ततस्तिर्यग्योनिषु जायते ॥ पद्म IV. 94. 68. 88–90; बहुशास्त्रं समभ्यस्य बहून्वेदान् सविस्तरान् । पुंसोऽश्रुतपुराणस्य न सम्यग्याति दर्शनम् ॥ पद्म IV. 105. 13.

1474. अतः स परमो धर्मो यो वेदादधिगम्यते । अवरः स तु विज्ञेयो यः पुराणादिषु स्मृतः ॥ व्यास q. by अपरार्क p. 9, हे. on व्रत I. p. 22, परिभाषाप्रकाश p. 29. The कृ. र. p. 39 reads 'अपरः स तु विज्ञेयो'. It may be noted that while अपरार्क read अवरः (inferior), the कृ. र. (about two centuries later than अपरार्क) reads अपरः (another).

and the like was *inferior*. This gradually changed and dharma was said to be of three kinds, Vaidika, Tāntrika and Miśra and it was said in the Bhāgavata[1475] and the Padma that one may worship god Viṣṇu in any one of the three ways that one desired. The Padma adds that the Vaidika and Miśraka methods are declared to be proper for brāhmaṇas and the like, while the Tāntrika method of worship is meant for a devotee of Viṣṇu and also for śūdras. The Devībhāgavata (XI. 1. 21–23) states that Śruti (Veda) and Smṛti are the eyes of dharma and Purāṇa its heart, and that that is dharma which is declared by these three and that *dharma* can be found nowhere else than in these, that in Purāṇas sometimes what is found in Tantras is put forward as dharma, but one should not accept that.

The Bhaviṣya (Brāhmaparva I. 43–47) in a dialogue between Śatānīka and Sumantu) first enumerates the 18 dharma-śāstras from Manu to Atri, states that the Vedas, the śāstras of Manu and others and the aṅgas are promulgated for the three varṇas and not for the benefit of śūdras, that śūdras appear to be very much helpless; how can they be able to secure the four *puruṣārthas?* They are devoid of āgama (traditional lore); what traditional lore was declared for them by the wise among the brāhmaṇas for enabling them to secure the three viz. dharma, artha and kāma? Sumantu replies:[1476] listen to the Dharmaśāstras that were declared by wise men for the benefit of all four varṇas and specially for śūdras viz. the 18 Purāṇas, the life of Rāma of the Raghu race (i. e. the Rāmāyaṇa) and the Bhārata

---

1475. वैदिकस्तान्त्रिको मिश्र इति मे त्रिविधो मखः । त्रयाणामीप्सितेनैव विधिना मां समर्चयेत् ॥ भागवत XI. 27. 7, q. by नित्याचारपद्धति p. 510; पद्म (IV. 90. 3–4) reads वैदिक…श्रीविष्णोस्त्रिविधो मखः । त्रयाणामुदितेनैव विधिना हरिमर्चयेत् ॥ वैदिको मिश्रको वापि विप्रादीनामुदाहृतः । तान्त्रिको विष्णुभक्तस्य शूद्रस्यापि प्रकीर्तितः ॥. Vide अग्निपु० 372. 34 for almost the same words as in भागवत. Compare वृद्धहारीतस्मृति 11. 77 'श्रौतस्मार्तागमैर्विष्णोस्त्रिविधं पूजनं स्मृतम् । एतच्छ्रौतं ततः स्मार्तं पौरुषेण च यत्स्मृतम् ॥'.

1476. चतुर्णामपि वर्णानां यानि प्रोक्तानि श्रेयसे । धर्मशास्त्राणि राजेन्द्र शृणु तानि नृपोत्तम ॥ विशेषतश्च शूद्राणां पावनानि मनीषिभिः ॥ अष्टादश पुराणानि चरितं राघवस्य च । रामस्य कुरुशार्दूल धर्मकामार्थसिद्धये । तथोक्तं भारतं वीर पाराशर्येण धीमता । वेदार्थं सकलं योज्य धर्मशास्त्राणि च प्रभो । कृपालुना कृतं शास्त्रं चतुर्णामिह श्रेयसे । वर्णानां भवमग्नानां कृतं पोतो ह्यनुत्तमम् । भविष्य, ब्राह्मपर्व 1. 53–57; श्रा. क्रि. कौ. p. 66 quotes the verses अष्टादश…धीमता. The भागवत also says that the whole meaning of the Veda was put forward under the name Bhārata, in which even women and śūdras find what *dharma* is: 'भारतव्यपदेशेन ह्याम्नायार्थश्च दर्शितः । दृश्यते यत्र धर्मादि स्त्रीशूद्रादिभिरप्युत ॥ भागवत I. 4. 29. Vide above p. 870 and note 1408 about the lack of antiquity in the case of this passage from Bhaviṣya (Brāhmaparva).

declared by Parāśara's son (Vyāsa); the compassionate Vyāsa composed a śāstra for the benefit of all four varṇas in which he comprehended the entire meaning of the Veda and the Dharmaśāstras; it is an unparalleled boat for all that are engulfed in *saṁsāra.* This makes it clear that the Purāṇas, the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa embody pristine traditions and thoughts and were deemed to have been composed as the instruments of the education and enlightenment of the common people. As a matter of fact we find that some Purāṇas like Agni, Matsya, Viṣṇudharmottara are encyclopaedic and include treatises on politics and government, on law, medicine, astronomy, astrology, poetry, music, sculpture &c. They illustrate India's life and character as a country and exemplify Bhārata's achievements, weaknesses and shortcomings. Two questions that arise are: (1) could the Purāṇas including the Vedic mantras quoted therein be read by the śūdras themselves; (2) supposing that Vedic mantras could not be read by the śūdras, could they, if they were able to do so, by themselves read the purāṇas without a brāhmaṇa's help. All writers of digests and commentaries were agreed that śūdras could not read or listen to the Vedic mantras contained in the Purāṇas (which being meant for the benefit of all varṇas contained Vedic mantras also), but only those that belonged to the three upper classes. Some writers, however, were agreeable to śūdras reciting Paurāṇika mantras in religious rites, relying on a passage of the Padmapurāṇa. But others like Kamalākarabhaṭṭa, author of the Nirṇayasindhu and Śūdrakamalākara, held relying on verses of the Bhaviṣya that Paurāṇika mantras alone were to be used by a brāhmaṇa in a religious rite for a śūdra, that the śūdra was only to listen to the reading of a purāṇa by a brāhmaṇa reader. There was a third view held by Śrīdatta and others that a śūdra could recite a paurāṇika mantra, but he should not himself read the Purāṇas and should only listen to the reading of Purāṇas by a brāhmaṇa. In the times of the Dharmasūtras the only mantras employed were mostly Vedic and therefore in the case of śūdras Gautama[1477] provided that the śūdras were allowed the alternative of saying 'namaḥ' in place of a Vedic mantra. In the centuries preceding Christ the śūdras would naturally have been attracted to Buddha's teaching as it was addressed to all including śūdras. Comparatively early orthodox writers like

---

1477. अनुज्ञातोऽस्य नमस्कारो मन्त्रः । गौ. X. 66; compare the quotation from the Padma in note 1469 p. 922.

Kumārila knew that the śūdras formed the largest number of professed Buddhists when he says[1478] 'the dicta of Śākya and others were all opposed, except a few relating to self-restraint, charity and the like, to all the fourteen sources of learning, were promulgated by Buddha and others that had strayed from the path of the three Vedas and did acts contrary (to the Veda) and that those dicta were presented by them to those who were deluded, who were outside the pale of the three Vedas, who mostly comprised the 4th varṇa (i. e. śūdra) and those that had lost caste'. Therefore, the learned brāhmaṇas who wanted to wean sections of the masses (including śūdras) away from Buddhist teachings composed new Paurāṇika mantras by the thousand and employed them in all religious rites like śrāddhas, vratas &c. It was, therefore, that earlier *nibandha* writers like Śrīdatta were prepared to allow śūdras to recite Paurāṇika[1479] mantras. But when centuries had elapsed after Buddhism had disappeared from India, orthodox brāhmaṇa writers like Kamalākara[1480] (who wrote his N. S. in 1612 A. D.) showed a stiffer attitude by confining śūdras merely to the listening to Purāṇas read by a brāhmaṇa and by not allowing them even to recite a Paurāṇika mantra. It may be noted that the Narasiṁhapurāṇa in laying down the duties of śūdras provides that they should listen to the reading of purāṇas by a brāhmaṇa

---

1478. शाक्यादिवचनानि तु कतिपयदमदानादिवचनवर्जं सर्वाण्येव समस्तचतुर्दशविद्यास्थानविरुद्धानि त्रयीमार्गव्युत्थितविरुद्धाचरणैश्च बुद्धादिभिः प्रणीतानि । त्रयीबाह्येभ्यश्चतुर्थवर्णनिरवसितप्रायेभ्यो व्यामूढेभ्यः समर्पितानीति न वेदमूलत्वेन सम्भाव्यन्ते। तन्त्रवार्तिक on जै. I. 3. 4 p. 195 (Ānan). The 14 विद्यास्थानs are numerated in या. I. 3 quoted above and in भविष्य (ब्राह्मपर्व 2. 6). Four more विद्यास्थानs are sometimes added, viz आयुर्वेदो धनुर्वेदो गान्धर्वश्चैव ते त्रयः । अर्थशास्त्रं चतुर्थं तु विद्या ह्यष्टादशैव ताः ॥ भविष्य (ब्राह्म) 2. 7 and विष्णुपु० III. 6. 28. This verse and अङ्गानि वेदाश्चत्वारः (विष्णु III. 6. 27) are quoted by कल्पतरु (ब्रह्मचारि० p. 2) and by हे. on व्रत vol. I. p. 18 and कृ. र. p. 27. For निरवसित meaning बहिष्कृत, vide पाणिनि 'शूद्राणामनिरवसितानाम्' II. 4. 10 and the महाभाष्य thereon.

1479. अत्र केचित्। वैदिकमन्त्रो विप्रस्य पौराणस्तु शूद्रैः पठनीयः – न हि वेदेष्वधिकारः कश्चिच्छूद्रस्य दृश्यते। पुराणेष्वधिकारो मे दर्शितो ब्राह्मणैरिह – इति तत्रैव पाद्मोक्तेरित्याहुः। गौडा अप्येवम्। नि. सि. p. 392.

1480. अध्येतव्यं ब्राह्मणेन वैश्येन क्षत्रियेण च। श्रोतव्यमेव शूद्रेण नाध्येतव्यं कदाचन। श्रौतं स्मार्तं च वै धर्मं प्रोक्तमस्मिन्द्विजोत्तम। तस्माच्छूद्रैर्विना विप्रं न श्रोतव्यं कदाचनेति तत्रैव पुराणाधिकारे भविष्योक्तेश्च। ...तेन पौराणमन्त्राणामेव विप्रेण पाठो न वैदिकानामिति सिद्धम्। नि. सि. p. 392. The printed भविष्य (ब्राह्म) 1. 72–74 are अध्येतव्यं न चान्येन ब्राह्मणं क्षत्रियं विना। श्रोतव्यमेव शूद्रेण नाध्येतव्यं कदाचन। ...श्रौतं स्मार्तं...कदाचन॥ These are q. by श्रा. क्रि. कौ. p. 76. पुराणश्रवणं विप्रात्नरसिंहस्य पूजनम्। नरसिंहपुराण 58. 13.

(reader) and should worship Narasiṁha (*avatāra* of Viṣṇu). The relation of Śruti, Smṛti and Purāṇas and their spheres of application are summed up in the Nāradīyapurāṇa as follows:—"The Veda exists in different forms; there is the Veda which has the performance of sacrificial rites (as its sphere); smṛtis are the Veda for the householder's stage; both those are centered in (or supported by) the Purāṇas. Just as this wonderful world sprang from the ancient Being (God), there is no doubt that all this literature arose from the Purāṇas. I hold that the meaning (or purpose) of the Purāṇas is more extensive (or superior to) than the meaning (or purpose) of the Veda. All the Vedas always rest on the Purāṇas; the Veda is afraid of the man of little learning (with the thought that) that man may harm it. The Veda does not deal with the movements of the planets, nor does it contain correct calculations about the proper times (for religious acts), nor does it deal with the *tithivṛddhi* or *tithikṣaya*, nor with the determination of the *parvans* (amāvāsyā, pūrṇimā &c.) or eclipses. Determinations about these were formerly made in Itihāsa and Purāṇas. What is not seen in the Vedas is all noticed in the Smṛtis; what is not seen in both is declared in the Purāṇas. What is declared by the Vedas and what is declared by the auxiliary lores—it is Veda that is declared by Smṛtis and Purāṇas. The person who looks upon Purāṇas in any other light would be born as a lower animal'.[1481] The Nāradīyapurāṇa[1482] further states 'the merit acquired by those wicked men who speak about Purāṇas as *arthavādas* (mere laudatory[1483] or condemnatory statements) are destroyed and

---

1481. शृणु मोहिनि मद्वाक्यं वेदोयं बहुधा स्थितः। यज्ञकर्मक्रिया वेदः स्मृतिर्वेदो गृहाश्रमे॥ स्मृतिर्वेदः क्रियावेदः पुराणेषु प्रतिष्ठितः। पुराणपुरुषाज्जातं यथेदं जगदद्भुतम्॥ तथेदं वाङ्मयं जातं पुराणेभ्यो न संशयः। <u>वेदार्थादधिकं</u> मन्ये <u>पुराणार्थं वरानने</u>॥ वेदाः प्रतिष्ठिताः सर्वे पुराणेष्वेव सर्वदा। बिभेत्यल्पश्रुताद्वेदो मामयं प्रहरिष्यति॥ न वेदे ग्रहसञ्चारो न शुद्धिः कालबोधिनी। तिथिवृद्धिः क्षयो वापि पर्वग्रहविनिर्णयः॥ इतिहासपुराणैस्तु निश्चयोयं कृतः पुरा। यन्न दृष्टं हि वेदेषु तत्सर्वं लक्ष्यते स्मृतौ॥ उभयोर्यन्न दृष्टं हि तत्पुराणैः प्रगीयते। ···यद्वेदैर्गीयते सुभ्रु उपाङ्गैर्यत्प्रगीयते॥ पुराणैः स्मृतिभिश्चैव वेद एव निगद्यते। पुराणमन्यथा मत्वा तिर्यग्योनिमवाप्नुयात्॥ नारदीयपुराण II. 24. 15–24. Some of these verses (such as वेदाः प्रतिष्ठिताः ···मामयं चालयिष्यति and यन्न दृष्टं···गीयते) occur in स्कन्द, प्रभासखण्ड, 2. 90–92.

1482. पुराणेष्वर्थवादत्वं ये वदन्ति नराधमाः। तैरर्जितानि पुण्यानि क्षयं यान्ति द्विजोत्तमाः। समस्तकर्मनिर्मूलसाधनानि नराधमाः। पुराणान्यर्थवादेन (पुराणान्यर्थवादेन?) ब्रुवन् नरकमश्नुते॥ नारदीय I. 1. 57–59.

1483. The great अर्थवादाधिकरण is जै. I. 2. 1–18. There are Vedic passages like 'सोऽरोदीद्यदरोदीत्तद्रुद्रस्य रुद्रत्वम्' (तै. सं. I. 5. 1. 1), 'स आत्मनो वपामुदखिदत्' (तै. सं. II. 1. 1), 'देवा वै देवयजनमध्यवसाय दिशो न प्राजानन्' (तै. सं.

(Continued on next page)

the wicked man who regards as *arthavādas* the Purāṇas that are the means of uprooting (the evil effects of) all acts, reaches Hell'.

The Purāṇas introduced several striking changes in the religious rites, practices and ideals of the people. The most characteristic thought and the keynote of the Purāṇas is to declare how great rewards and results could be secured with little effort. The Viṣṇupurāṇa (VI. 2) narrates how sages approached Vyāsa with the question 'in what age does a little *dharma* yield very great rewards'? Vyāsa was bathing in the Ganges; he came out, uttered 'śūdra is good and Kali is good' and then again plunged into the river; then he again came out and said 'well done, O śūdra! you are blessed'; he again plunged into the river, came out and said 'women are good and blessed; who is more blessed than they'. When he finished his bath and performed his morning rites, the sages asked him to explain what he meant by calling Kali, śūdras and women good and blessed. He replied: 'a man secures in a single day and night in Kali age as much reward of *tapas*, celibacy and *japa* as is obtained in ten years in Kṛta age, in one year in Tretā and in a month in Dvāpara; therefore, I spoke of Kali as good; in Kali age a man secures merely by the glorification or incessant repetition of the name of Keśava what he would secure by deep meditation in Kṛta, by sacrifices in Tretā, and by worship in Dvāpara; I am pleased with Kali because a man secures great eminence of dharma with a little effort. Persons of the three higher varṇas have to study the Vedas after observing many strict rules, then they have to perform sacrifices which require wealth; they incur sin if they do not perform their duties properly; they cannot eat and drink as they please, but are dependent on the observance of many rules as to food &c.; dvijas secure higher worlds after great trouble; the śūdra secures his worlds by serving the three varṇas, he has the right to offer the *pākayajñas* (without mantras) and therefore he is more blessed than a dvija. He has not to observe strict rules about proper and disallowed food or drink and therefore he was

---

(*Continued from last page*)

VI. 1. 5. 1), 'तरति ब्रह्महत्यां योऽश्वमेधेन यजते' (तै. सं. V. 3. 12. 2), 'न पृथिव्यामग्निश्चेतव्यो नान्तरिक्षे न दिवि। तै. सं. V. 2. 7. The question is : are these passages to be taken literally or do they convey any meaning ? The reply is : 'विधिना त्वेकवाक्यत्वात् स्तुत्यर्थेन विधीनां स्युः' (जै. I. 2. 7) i.e. they are laudatory and are meant to praise vidhis.

declared 'good' by me. A woman by serving her husband in thought, word, and deed secures with less trouble the same worlds that her husband secures with great effort and trouble and therefore I said a third time about women that they were blessed. The acquistion of *dharma* is secured with small trouble in Kali age by men who wash off all their sins by the water in the form of the qualities of their soul; śūdras do the same by being intent on service to dvijas and women also secure the same without trouble by service to their husbands. Therefore all these three are regarded by me as most blessed.'[1484] The Brahmapurāna chapter 229 verses 62–80 are identical with Viṣṇupurāṇa VI. 2. 15–30 and 34–36. The Viṣṇupurāṇa emphasizes that each one must do one's duty in the society in which one is born or one's duty which one has undertaken, that, if a person does this, he reaches the same higher worlds, whether he be a brāhmana or a śūdra. This doctrine is the same as taught in the Bhagavadgītā[1485] 18. 45 and 46 'a person secures the highest perfection (final emancipation) by being intent on carrying out the duties appropriate to him; man secures perfection (or bliss) by worshipping with the performance of his peculiar duties (not with flowers and the like or by words) Him from whom all beings proceed and by whom all this (world) is enveloped'. Ancient works like the Vedas, Jaimini's sūtras on Mīmāṁsā and the Vedāntasutras did not consider or discuss how women or śūdras were to secure higher spiritual life and final Beatitude. The Vedāntasūtra (I. 3. 34–38) denies to the śūdra the right to study the Veda and the Upaniṣads. Buddha's teaching held out the same promise of liberation from suffering

---

1484. Some of the verses are striking and they are therefore quoted here: ध्यायन्कृते यजन्यज्ञैस्त्रेतायां द्वापरेऽर्चयन्। यदाप्नोति तदाप्नोति कलौ संकीर्त्य केशवम्॥ धर्मोत्कर्षमतीवात्र प्राप्नोति पुरुषः कलौ। अल्पायासेन धर्मज्ञास्तेन तुष्टोऽस्म्यहं कलेः॥ ...जयन्ति ते निजाँल्लोकान् क्लेशेन महता द्विजाः॥ द्विजशुश्रूषयैवैष पाकयज्ञाधिकारवान्। निजाञ्जयति वै लोकान् शूद्रो धन्यतरस्ततः॥ भक्ष्याभक्ष्येषु नास्यास्ति पेयापेयेषु वै यतः। नियमो मुनिशार्दूलास्तेनासौ साध्वितीरितः। ...योषिच्छुश्रूषणाद्भर्तुः कर्मणा मनसा गिरा। तद्धिता शुभमाप्नोति तत्सालोक्यं यतो द्विजाः॥ नातिक्लेशेन महता तानेव पुरुषो यथा। तृतीयं व्याहृतं तेन मया साध्विति योषितः॥ ...स्वल्पेन हि प्रयत्नेन धर्मः सिध्यति वै कलौ। नरैरात्मगुणाम्भोभिः क्षालिताखिलकिल्बिषैः॥ शूद्रैश्च द्विजशुश्रूषा तत्परैर्द्विजसत्तमाः। तथा स्त्रीभिरनायासात् पतिशुश्रूषयैव हि। ततस्त्रितयमप्येतन्मम धन्यतरं मतम्। धर्मसम्पादने क्लेशो द्विजातीनां कृतादिषु॥ विष्णुपु० VI. 2. 17–18, 22–24, 28–28, 34–36. The कल्पतरु (गृहस्थकाण्ड pp. 272–273) quotes from विष्णु VI. 3. 22–24 पारतन्त्र्य...रितः (तम् v. l.). The editor of कल्पतरु was unable to trace these.

1485. स्वे स्वे कर्मण्यभिरतः संसिद्धिं लभते नरः। ...यतः प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानां येन सर्वमिदं ततम्। स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः॥ भगवद्गीता 18. 45–46.

to all men irrespective of class or caste and was therefore most attractive to śūdras. The Bhagavadgītā and the Purāṇas changed the whole outlook of Indian society, high or low, and promised the same higher spiritual life or worlds to all who did their work under a sense of social duty, did not hanker after mundane rewards and brought all their actions, in whatever avocation they might be engaged, as an offering to God. In the Padmapurāṇa[1486] Vyāsa is made to say to Yudhiṣṭhira: "It is not possible to observe in the Kali age the rules of Dharma laid down by Manu and by the Vedas; the one thing which one should do is to observe a fast on Ekādaśī in both fortnights (of a month), which is an easy means (that) requires little wealth, that entails little trouble, but yields great rewards, that is the very essence (of the teachings) of all Purāṇas; he should be pure and on Dvādaśī after worshipping Keśava with flowers he should first feed brāhmaṇas and then himself take his meal; those who desire to secure heaven should perform this vrata throughout their lives; even persons of evil conduct, the greatest sinners devoid of dharma, do not go to Yama (do not fall into hell) if they fast on Ekādaśī." The Sūtasaṁhitā states 'effort for acquiring true knowledge (of the Self) is meant for all (for persons even lower than śūdras), that effort made by explaining in a different language (than Sanskrit) and by the lapse of enough time will tend to the good (of the lowest)'. This clearly shows how the Purāṇas put before all people easy ways whereby they could attain bliss in the Hereafter.

The Baud.[1487] Dh. S., Manu and Vasiṣṭha emphasize that one should not invite a large company of brāhmaṇas at a śrāddha, because a large company destroys these five (advantages) viz. showing proper respect to invitees, propriety of place and time, cleanliness and the securing of worthy brāhmaṇas and

---

1486. वेदव्यास उवाच। श्रुता ये मानवा धर्मा वैदिकाश्च श्रुतास्त्वया। कलौ युगे न शक्यन्ते ते वै कर्तुं नराधिप॥ सुखोपायमल्पधनमल्पक्लेशं महाफलम्। पुराणानां च सर्वेषां सारभूतं महामते॥ एकादश्यां न भुञ्जीत पक्षयोरुभयोरपि। द्वादश्यां तु शुचिर्भूत्वा पुष्पैः संपूज्य केशवम्॥ भुञ्जीत कृतकृत्यस्तु पश्चाद्विप्रपुरःसरम्। ...यावज्जीवं व्रतमिदं कर्तव्यं पुरुषर्षभ। स्वर्गतिं प्राप्तुमिच्छद्भिरत्र मे नास्ति संशयः॥ अपि पापदुराचाराः पापिष्ठा धर्मवर्जिताः। एकादश्यां न भुञ्जन्ति न ते यान्ति यमान्तिकम्॥ पद्म VI. 53. 4-9. These verses are quoted as from महाभारत by हे. on व्रत vol. I. p. 1089. Vide p 44 note 108 above for some of these verses; अन्येषामपि सर्वेषां ज्ञानाभ्यासो विधीयते। भाषान्तरेण कालेन तेषां सोऽप्युपकारकः॥ सूतसंहिता I. 7. 22.

1487. सत्क्रियां देशकालौ च शौचं ब्राह्मणसम्पदः। पञ्चैतान् विस्तरो हन्ति तस्मात्नेहेत विस्तरम्॥ मनु III. 26, कूर्मपुराण II. 22. 27, बौ. ध. सू. II. 4. 30, वसिष्ठ XI. 28 (the last two read the 4th pāda as 'तस्मात्तं परिवर्जयेत्').

it was further provided by the Anuśāsana-parva[1488] and others that one should not go deep into examining the learning, family and character of brāhmaṇas in a rite for the gods, but in rites for the Manes close examination as to these matters is proper (or justified). The Purānas went against both these prescriptions. They are not tired of recommending again and again profuse expense in śrāddhas and condemning stinginess (lit. roguishness in spending money) in śrāddhas and also in such other matters as the observances of Ekādaśī. For example, the Viṣṇupurāna[1489] quotes nine verses (III. 14. 22–30) as uttered by the pitrs, two of which may be translated here 'Would that a wise and blessed person be born in our family who not indulging in stinginess in spending wealth will offer pindas to us and who would donate to brāhmanas for our sake jewels, clothes, a large conveyance, wealth and all enjoyments if he has riches'! Padma[1490] recommends that avoiding stinginess brings pleasure to the *pitṛs*. The Matsya (56. 11) prescribes that one should not show stinginess in the Kṛsnāstamīvrata. The Padma says that that bad man who being possessed of wealth celebrates the *jāgara* on Ekādaśī in a close-fisted way loses his soul. The Brahmapurāna[1491] says in a general way that whoever does a religious act with stinginess is a sinner.

Manu (III. 149) provides that 'in rites in honour of gods one who knows dharma should not critically examine the brāhmanas to be invited for dinner, but in a rite for ancestors one should carefully investigate (the fitness of) brāhmanas'. This does not mean that in rites for gods any one may be invited. We have to observe the general rule of Manu (III. 128) that donors should give only to a man who has studied the Veda

---

1488. ब्राह्मणान्न परीक्षेत क्षत्रियो दानधर्मवित् । दैवे कर्मणि पित्र्ये तु न्याय्यमाहुः परीक्षणम् ॥ अनुशासन 90. 2; q. by हे. on श्राद्ध p 511; दैवे कर्मणि ब्राह्मणं न परीक्षेत । प्रयत्नात्पित्र्ये परीक्षेत । विष्णुधर्मसू. 82. 1–2; न ब्राह्मणान् परीक्षेत सदा देये तु मानवः । दैवे कर्मणि पित्र्ये च श्रूयते वै परीक्षणम् । वायु 83. 51.

1489. अपि धन्यः कुले जायादस्माकं मतिमान्नरः । अकुर्वन् वित्तशाठ्यं यः पिण्डान्नो निर्वपिष्यति ॥ रत्नं वस्त्रं महायानं सर्वभोगादिकं वसु । विभवे सति विप्रेभ्यो योऽस्मानुद्दिश्य दास्यति ॥ विष्णु. III. 14. 22–23, वराह 13. 50–51 (reads सर्वं तोयादिकं वसु). All the following seven verses are the same in both पुराणs. Verses III. 14. 24–30 are q. by श्रा. क्रि. कौ. pp. 253–254 and are also explained.

1490. वित्तशाठ्येन रहितः पितृभ्यः प्रीतिमाहरन् । पद्म I. 9. 181; धनवान् वित्तशाठ्येन यः करोति प्रजागरम् । तेनात्मा हारितो नूनं कितवेन दुरात्मना ॥ पद्म VI. 39. 21.

1491. वित्तशाठ्येन यो धर्मं करोति स तु पातकी । ब्रह्म 123. 174.

dinner in rites for gods or pitṛs. So what Manu III. 149 means is that deep investigation of ancestry &c. is not necessary in rites for gods.

It is provided by the Vāyu[1492] that there is to be no examination of the qualities and character of the brāhmaṇas at Gayā and the Varāhapurāṇa provides that all brāhmanas of Mathurā are like gods and that a brāhmana of Mathurā not knowing even a *ṛk* verse is superior to a brāhmaṇa of another place that has studied the four Vedas. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 579, 670 for details of Gayā and Mathurā brāhmanas. The Padmapurāṇa and the Skanda (Kāśīkhaṇḍa 6. 56-57) recommend that at tīrthas (sacred places) one should not engage in investigation (of the worth) of brāhmaṇas, and that Manu declares that brāhmaṇas appearing (at a tīrtha) and desiring food should be fed.[1493]

It is not unlikely that the above passages from the Vāyu, Varāha and Padma are later interpolations. When Buddhism was flourishing large companies of Buddhist monks were fed by the people. When Buddhism declined and disappeared from India after the 12th or 13th century A. D. people came to believe that there was great merit in feeding poor brāhmaṇas just as in former times people fed monks and the Purāṇas might have only echoed and emphasized the general sentiments of the people. If the people in general had not come to believe in this, the author feels that no amount of interpolations or insistence by the so-called crafty brāhmaṇas would have been effective. Writers, Western or Indian, that, relying on the notions current in the 19th and 20th centuries, pass severe and unmeasured strictures on the provisions for brāhmaṇas in the Purāṇas do great injustice to the authors of Purāṇas that flourished about a thousand years ago or more. Such writers should compare Indian medieval conditions, ideas and doings of brāhmaṇas with the claims of the Popes, Christian priests, Inquisitions and the state of monastic Orders in Europe from about the 10th century A. D. to the 15th century. In comparison it would be

---

1492. न विचार्यं कुलं शीलं विद्यां च तप एव च । पूजितैस्तैस्तु राजेन्द्र मुक्तिं प्राप्नोति मानवः ॥ वायु 82. 27; अनृग्वै माथुरो यत्र चतुर्वेदस्तथापरः । वेदैश्चतुर्भिर्न च स्यान्माथुरेण समः क्वचित् ॥ '''मथुरायां ये वसन्ति विष्णुरूपा हि ते नराः ॥ वराह 165. 55 and 57.

1493. तीर्थेषु ब्राह्मणं नैव परीक्षेत कथंचन । अन्नार्थिनमनुप्राप्तं भोज्यं तं मनुरब्रवीत् ॥ पद्म V. 29. 212. The first half is q. by श्रा. क्रि. कौ. from ब्रह्मपुराण on p. 34 and from देवीपुराण on p. 266.

found that the conditions in Europe were terribly worse than in India in those centuries.[1494]

As a consequence of the abovementioned dominating principle the Purāṇas strongly recommend *dāna* (gifts, particularly of food), pilgrimages and baths in sacred waters, vratas, ahiṁsā, bhakti, repetition of the name of god, śrāddhas &c. These will be briefly illustrated below.

The Purāṇas institute a comparison between solemn Vedic sacrifices on the one hand and pilgrimages and baths at sacred places on the other. The Vanaparva[1495] contrasts the two as follows, "the solemn sacrifices promulgated by the sages cannot be accomplished by a poor man; sacrifices require many implements and a collection of various materials, which are secured by kings or sometimes by rich men, but not by poor men who have to rely on themselves alone, who have no helpers and who do not possess means. Going to holy places confers merit and surpasses sacrifices. One does not secure that reward by such sacrifices as Agniṣṭoma, in which profuse fees are distributed, which is secured by repairing to sacred places." Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV pp. 561–564 for further encomiums of sacred places and the virtues to be cultivated for reaping the full merit of pilgrimages.

In pursuance of the same dominant principle the Anuśāsana-parva and Purāṇas extol fasts and vratas. The Anuśāsana-

---

1494. For the barbarities and abominations in every European country of the Inquisition, particularly in Spain, one may read W. H. Rule's 'History of the Inquisition' (1868), particulary pp. 298–314 on 'Inquisition in Goa' and Rafael Sabatini's work on 'Torquemeda and the Spanish Inquisition' (8th ed. in 1937), 'the Spanish Inquisition' by Prof. A. S. Turberville (Home University Library, 1932), who is constrained to say on p. 235 that at the best the Holy Office in Spain has a terrible record of destruction; Cambridge Medieval History vol. VI, chap. XX on 'Heresies and the Inquisition in the Middle Ages' (1929) pp. 699–726; Cambridge Medieval History vol. VI, pp. 694–695 where it is shown that 'Indulgences' (granting forgiveness of sins and a certificate of entry in Paradise) were freely put on sale by the highest ministers of the Christian Church in the hands of licensed traders without the necessity of any confession and penitence and that they became a formidable bar to the proper working of the penitential system of the Church.

1495. तीर्थाभिगमनं पुण्यं यज्ञैरपि विशिष्यते । वनपर्व 82. 17; vide H. of Dh. vol. IV p. 561 n 1263 for the whole passage.

parva[1496] (107. 5-6) remarks that fasts are equal to sacrifices in the matter of rewards. They are put forward as superior to sacrifices in Padma.[1497] It says: Viṣṇuvrata is super-eminent; a hundred Vedic sacrifices are not equal to it; by performing a sacrifice one may go to heaven, but one who observes the Kārtikavrata goes to Vaikuṇṭha (the world of Viṣṇu). For the exaggerated importance attached to fasts and vratas, vide pp. 43-45 above.

First *dāna*. High eulogies of gifts have been sung from the Ṛgveda downwards. The subject of dāna (gifts) in all its aspects has been dealt with in the H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 837-888. The Mahābhārata in numerous places (particularly in the whole of Anuśāsana-parva) and the Purāṇas such as Matsya chap. 82-92 and 274-289, Agni chap. 208-213, Varāha 99-111, Padma V. 21. 81-213 (which agree almost verbatim with Matsya 83-92), Padma II. 39-40 and 94, III. 24, Kūrma II. 26 devote a great deal of space to the subject of *dānas*. But here only two topics in relation to gifts will be dealt with, viz. gifts of food and gifts to brāhmaṇas. The Ṛgveda condemns the person as merely a sinful one who does not offer food to the gods nor to his friends and uses it only to fill his own belly.[1193] The Ait. Br. and the Tai.[1499] Br. speak of 'food' as 'prāṇa' (life). The Baud.[1500] Dh. S. states "all beings depend on food, the Veda says 'food is life,' therefore food should be given (to others), food is the highest offering". Manu[1501] and Viṣṇu Dh. S. state 'the man who cooks food only for his own sake (and not for offering to gods and men) eats merely sin'. The Bhagavadgītā carries the same message 'those who eat food left after offering in sacrifice are freed from all sins, but those who cook food for their sake alone eat sin'. The Padma has a fine passage 'those who always feed the cripple, the blind, children, old men, persons that are dis-

---

1496. इदमङ्गिरसा प्रोक्तमुपवासफलात्मकम्। विधिं यज्ञफलैस्तुल्यं तन्निबोध युधिष्ठिर॥ अनुशासन 107. 5-6.

1497. श्रेष्ठं विष्णुव्रतं विप्र तत्तुल्या न शतं मखाः। कृत्वा क्रतुं व्रजेत्स्वर्गं वैकुण्ठं कार्तिकव्रती॥ पद्म III. 21. 29. The same idea is repeated in पद्म VI. 96. 25.

1498. मोघमन्नं विन्दते अप्रचेताः सत्यं ब्रवीमि वध इत्स तस्य। नार्यमणं पुष्यति नो सखायं केवलाघो भवति केवलादी॥ ऋ. X. 117. 6.

1499. अन्नं प्राणमन्नमपानमाहुः। तै. ब्रा. II. 8. 8. 3; अन्नं ह प्राणः। ऐ. ब्रा. 33. 1 in the fifth gāthā recited by नारद).

1500. अन्ने श्रितानि भूतानि अन्नं प्राणमिति श्रुतिः। तस्मादन्नं प्रदातव्यमन्नं हि परमं हविः॥ बौ. ध. सू. II. 3. 68.

1501. अघं स केवलं भुङ्क्ते यः पचत्यात्मकारणात्। मनु. III. 118, विष्णुधर्मसूत्र 67.43.

eased, helpless and pinched by penury, always enjoy bliss in heaven; there is no end to the merit (accumulated) by constructing wells and tanks, where aquatic animals and others moving on land drink water when they desire, for water is the life of living beings and life is centred in water'. The distribution of food particularly to learned brāhmaṇas is highly praised in Brahma-purāṇa[1502] 218. 10–32, Padma V. 19. 289–307m, Agni 211. 44–46. 'The gift of food is superior to all gifts; food is the life of men, from food spring all beings; the worlds are dependent on food, therefore food is praised; man secures heaven by the gift of food; a person who joyfully gives food acquired by just means to brāhmaṇas deeply learned in the Veda is released from all sins' says Brahma. The Agnipurāṇa says 'The gifts of elephants, horses, chariots, male and female slaves and houses do not come up even to a sixteenth part of the gift of food (in merit); a person who committing a great sin afterwards distributes food becomes free from all sins and secures everlasting worlds' (211. 44-46). The Kūrma[1503] prescribes 'a man should give to a brahmacārin (Vedic student) food every day (i. e. when he comes begging); thereby he becomes free from all sins and reaches the abode of Brahmā'. Similarly, Padma calls upon house-holders to give as much cooked food to ascetics as would fill the begging bowl. From very ancient times a householder was called upon to perform five *Yajñas* (sacrifices) daily, two of which were *Baliharaṇa* and honouring a guest (Manu III. 70) and he was to place food on the ground for persons who had lost caste, who suffered from loathsome diseases, to cāṇḍālas, dogs, crows and even insects[1504] (Āp. Dh. S. II. 4. 9. 5, Manu III. 92). Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 745–747 on Vaiśvadeva and Baliharaṇa. Underlying these provisions was the noble sentiment of universal kindliness and charity, the persistent idea that, in spite of social gradations, rules and prejudices dividing

---

1502. सर्वेषामेव दानानामन्नं श्रेष्ठमुदाहृतम्। ...प्राणा ह्यन्नं मनुष्याणां तस्माज्जन्तुः प्रजायते॥ अन्ने प्रतिष्ठिता लोकास्तस्मादन्नं प्रशस्यते। ...अन्नस्य हि प्रदानेन स्वर्गमाप्नोति मानवः। ...न्यायेनावाप्तमन्नं तु नरो हर्षसमन्वितः। द्विजेभ्यो वेदवृद्धेभ्यो दत्त्वा पापात्प्रमुच्यते। ब्रह्मपु० 218. 10–13, 22–23.

1503. दद्यादहरहस्त्वन्नं श्रद्धया ब्रह्मचारिणे। सर्वपापविनिर्मुक्तः ब्रह्मणः स्थानमाप्नुयात्॥ कूर्म II. 26. 17 q. by दानसागर p. 370; यः पात्रपूर्णां भिक्षां यतीनां तु प्रयच्छति। विमुक्तः सर्वपापेभ्यो नासौ दुर्गतिमाप्नुयात्॥ पद्म V. 15. 140–141.

1504. सर्वान् वैश्वदेवे भागिनः कुर्वीता श्वचण्डालेभ्यः। आप. ध. सू. II. 4. 9. 5; शुनां च पतितानां च श्वपचां पापरोगिणाम्। वायसानां कृमीणां च शनकैर्निर्वपेद्भुवि॥ मनु. III. 92.

men from each other, one Supreme Light pervades and illuminates the meanest of creatures and makes the whole world kin. This spirit of a householder to regard it as his duty to offer food to all needy persons and particularly to poor and deserving students and brāhmaṇas has prevailed almost to the present day, though during the last few years shortage of food, high prices and rationing have undermined it a great deal.

Then as to gifts to brāhmanas. In the first place, it must be remembered that all brāhmaṇas were not priests and are not priests in modern times. Similarly, all priests in all Indian temples and shrines are not brāhmaṇas. Temple priests are comparatively a later institution and in olden times they were looked down upon and are regarded as inferior brāhmaṇas even in modern times. Manu (III. 152) states that a *devalaka* (a brāhmaṇa who performed for remuneration service before the image in a temple) was unfit to be invited at a śrāddha or to officiate in a sacrifice to gods, if he continuously served for three years in that capacity. The ideal set before brāhmaṇas from very ancient times was of poverty, of plain living and high thinking, of abandoning the active pursuit of riches, of devotion to the study of the Veda and śāstras, of cherishing a high culture and of handing down literature and cultural outlook. Smṛtis like Yāj. I. 213 recommend that even if a brāhmaṇa be fit for receiving a religious gift he should refuse gifts and thereby he secures the same worlds that habitual donors secure. It was for preserving such high ideals among brāhmaṇas that Yāj. I. 333 prescribes that a king should make gifts of cows, gold and land and should bestow on learned brāhmaṇas houses and requisites for marriage (maidens, expenses of marriages &c.). Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 856-858 where references are given to inscriptions containing donations to brāhmaṇas of houses and marriage expenses. In these days every body talks of the high culture and literary traditions of ancient India. But who cultivated the vast Vedic and other Sanskrit literature, preserved it and propagated it for several millenia? The answer would have to be that it was mostly due to some of the brāhmaṇas who stuck to the ancient ideal for thousands of years. If the Ṛgveda can be put forward in these days as the most ancient of the literary monuments in any Aryan language, who preserved its more than ten thousand verses with unparallelled care by oral transmission without hardly any variant readings. The reply will again have to be that the brāhmaṇas did it by a

self-denying ordinance. The Brāhmanas had to study the Veda with auxiliary lores without[1505] an eye to any ulterior motive, but simply as a duty and to understand the meaning thereof, they were to teach the Veda and other lores without demanding beforehand a fee, they had to bring up their own families, perform sacrifices and make gifts themselves. The only substantial sources of income were officiating at sacrifices and religious rites and receiving gifts. These sources must always have been variable, fitful and precarious. The brāhmaṇas had no power to tax people as in the case of tithes in the West. Nor had they a regularly paid hierarchy of deacons, priests, bishops and archbishops as in the Anglican Church Therefore, the brāhmanas are advised to approach the king or a rich person for their livelihood (vide Gautama IX. 63 'Yogakṣemārtham-Iśvaram adhigaccet). It should be noted that before Buddhism spread far and wide the sūtras and smṛtis emphasized that religious gifts should be made only to a worthy brāhmaṇa, learned and well-conducted. For example, Āpastamba[1506] prescribes 'one should invite for dinner in all religious acts brāhmaṇas that are pure, that have studied the Veda and that one should distribute gifts at a proper time and place, on occasions of purificatory rites and when there is a worthy recipient.' To the same effect are Vas. Dh. S. III. 8, VI. 30, Manu (III. 128, 132, IV. 31), Yāj. (I. 201), Daksa (III. 26 and 31). Not every brāhmaṇa was in those ancient times a proper recipient for a gift, but he had to possess qualities of what is called '*pātra*'. A few definitions of pātra may with advantage be cited here. The Anuśāsana-parva[1507] has a long passage emphasizing the qualities of a deserving brāhmaṇa : 'gifts made to good brāhmaṇas that are free from anger, that are intent on dharma, are devoted to truth and self-

---

1505. ब्राह्मणेन निष्कारणो धर्मः षडङ्गो वेदोऽध्येयो ज्ञेयश्चेति। महाभाष्य (Kielhorn, vol. I. p. 1) quotes it as आगम. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II pp. 105–110 on the duties of brāhmaṇas and their sources of income in ancient times.

1506. शुचीन् मन्त्रवतः सर्वकृत्येषु भोजयेत् । देशतः कालतः शौचतः सम्यक् प्रति गृहीतृत इति दानानि प्रतिपादयति। आप. ध. सू. II. 6 15. 9–10 Compare मनु III. 98.

1507. Some of the verses of अनुशासन 22 33–41 may be cited here: अक्रोधना धर्मपराः सत्यनित्या दमे रताः। तादृशाः साधवो विप्रास्तेभ्यो दत्तं महाफलम्। साङ्गांश्च चतुरो वेदानधीते यो द्विजर्षभः। षड्भ्यः प्रवृत्तः कर्मभ्यस्तं पात्रमृषयो विदुः॥ प्रज्ञाश्रुताभ्यां वृत्तेन शीलेन च समन्वितः। तारयेत कुलं सर्वमेकोऽपीह द्विजोत्तमः। ...निशम्य च गुणोपेतं ब्राह्मणं साधुसंमतम्। दूरादानाय्य सत्कृत्य सर्वतश्चापि पूजयेत्॥ verses 33, 36, 38, 41; on षड्भ्यः प्रवृत्तः the com. of नीलकण्ठ is 'अनुपदोक्तैः मधुमांसवर्जनमर्यादापालनशौचैः सह अध्ययनयागदानेभ्यः, तान्यनुष्ठातुं प्रवृत्त इत्यर्थः'

control yield great rewards; the sages regard that brāhmaṇa as *pātra* who studies the four Vedas with their *aṅgas* (auxiliary lores like phonetics, grammar &c.), who is active in doing six acts (viz. abstaining from wine and meat, observing the bounds of morality, purity, study of the Veda, sacrifices, making gifts). Even a single eminent brāhmaṇa endowed with intellect, Vedic learning, good conduct and character saves the whole family; one should bring from afar a brāhmaṇa on hearing that he is possessed of good qualities and is approved by good men and should welcome him and honour him in all ways'. Yāj. furnishes[1508] a brief but striking definition of a worthy brāhmaṇa 'not by Vedic learning alone nor by *tapas* (austere life) alone worthiness arises; that person is declared to be *pātra* (worthy recipient for a religious gift) where both these (i. e. Vedic learning and tapas) and good conduct exist'. Manu provides that religious gifts given to a brāhmaṇa who has not studied the Veda or who is avaricious or deceitful are fruitless and lead the donor to hell (IV. 192–194). The Bhagavadgītā also (17.22) condemns a gift given to an unworthy person as *tāmasa* (affected by *tamas*, arising from ignorance or delusion).

As Buddhism grew in popularity and secured also royal support, the brāhmaṇas had to tackle several tasks. They had to keep the number of brāhmaṇas at a high level, they had to find maintenance for those devoted to the deep study of the Veda and they had to make accommodation with prevalent Buddhist thoughts by assimilating as many of them as possible in their own writings. Every brāhmaṇa could not possess the memory, the intelligence and the persistent endeavour for long years required for memorizing and mastering even his own Veda and its subsidiary Literature. If one hundred brāhmaṇa families were patronized, hardly ten percent of them could have been masters of their own Veda, but there was always the possibility that those who were not themselves good Vedic scholars might have sons, some of whom might turn out to be profound students of the Veda. Therefore, the number of brāhmaṇas was to be increased and they had to be fed and not to be allowed to fritter away energy and time in working for their bread. It is mainly due to these factors that some of the Purāṇas contain incessant and frantic appeals for gifts to brāhmaṇas.

1508. न विद्यया केवलया तपसा वापि पात्रता । यत्र वृत्तमिमे चोभे तद्धि पात्रं प्रकीर्तितम् ॥ याज्ञ. I. 200.

At the time when most of the Purāṇas were composed, the brāhmaṇas were hemmed in by great difficulties and hostile forces. From about the 3rd century B. C. to the 7th century A. D. Buddhism enjoyed royal patronage under such great kings as Aśoka, Kaniṣka and Harṣa. Buddhism was not really a revolt against caste, but against the sacrificial system, against the Veda and its authority to show the way to salvation. Buddha did not found a new religion, but he was a great reformer of Hinduism. He laid sole stress on moral effort, ahiṁsā, satya &c. which had already been integrated into Hinduism and were part of it and which continue to this day to be part of Hinduism. Buddha in his first sermon in the deer-park near Banaras preached that one who renounced the world should shun two extremes[1509] viz. the pursuit of pleasures and the practice of useless austerities, that it is the course discovered by him that led to wisdom and *nirvāṇa*. He expounded the four noble Axioms or Truths (Āryasatyāni) viz. suffering (duḥkha), the cause of suffering[1510] viz. *taṇhā* i. e. tṛṣṇā (duḥkha-samudaya), the suppression of suffering (duḥkha-nirodha), and the way that leads to the suppression of suffering (duḥkha-nirodhagāminī paṭipadā). This last is the Noble Eight-fold path (aṭṭāṅgiko[1510a]

1509. For the two extremes to be shunned, vide Dhammacakka-ppavattana-sutta (inauguration of the kingdom of Righteousness) S. B. E. vol. XI. p. 146.

1510. It may be noted that in the Upaniṣads and महाभारत the giving up of तृष्णा or काम is emphasized. Vide यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि स्थिताः। अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते॥ कठोप० VI. 14; या दुस्त्यजा दुर्मतिभिर्या न जीर्यति जीर्यतः। योऽसौ प्राणान्तिको रोगस्तां तृष्णां त्यजतः सुखम्॥ वनपर्व 2. 36, अनुशासन 7. 21, ब्रह्माण्ड III. 68. 100; यच्च कामसुखं लोके यच्च दिव्यं महत्सुखम्। तृष्णाक्षयसुखस्यैते नार्हतः षोडशीं कलाम्॥ शान्ति. 174. 46, वायु 93. 101, ब्रह्माण्ड III. 68. 103.

1510 a. Vide Dhammacakka-ppavattana-sutta in S. B. E. vol. XI. p. 147 for the eightfold path. The Pāli words are: सम्मा-दिट्ठि, सम्मा-संकप्पो, सम्मा वाचा, सम्मा कम्मन्तो, सम्मा आजीवो, सम्मा-वायामो, सम्मा-सति (सम्यक् स्मृति) सम्मा-समाधि. Vide also दीघनिकाय (Pali Text Society) vol. I. p. 157, महावग्ग (Oldenberg) vol. I. p. 10 (I. 6. 18) and धम्म-चक्क-प्पवत्तनसुत्त para 4 p. 3 (ed. by Sister Vajirā, Sarnath) and for दुःख, दुःखसमुदय, दुःखनिरोध, दुःखनिरोधगामिनी पटिपदा, vide महावग्ग (I. 6.19–22), *ibid* p. 10. These four are called आर्यसत्यानि which may mean 'the four Noble Truths' or 'the four Truths found by the Ārya' (Buddha). This bears a very close resemblance to the fourfold axioms in Yoga and Medicine set out in योगसूत्रभाष्य 'यथा चिकित्साशास्त्रं चतुर्व्यूहम्-रोगो रोगहेतुरारोग्यं भैषज्यमिति, एवमिदमपि शास्त्रं चतुर्व्यूहमेव तद्यथा-संसारः संसारहेतुः, मोक्षः, मोक्षोपायः-इति। तत्र दुःखबहुलः संसारो हेयः। प्रधानपुरुषयोः संयोगो हेयहेतुः। संयोगस्यात्यन्तिकी निवृत्तिर्हानम्। हानोपायः सम्यग्दर्शनम्। योगभाष्य on योगसूत्र II. 15.

mārgaḥ) viz. right views, right thoughts or aspirations, right speech, right actions, right living, right exertion, right recollection (or mindfulness), right meditation (i. e. briefly leading a virtuous life). These doctrines preached to all by the noble Buddha and his disciples were attractive as remarked by Rhys Davids,[1511] particularly to the śūdras whose social position was low in the Vedic times and also in the days of the smṛtis. No one could study the Veda in the presence of a śūdra, a śūdra could not perform sacrifices and had to serve the three higher varṇas in very ancient times. Almost the same position was assigned to him by Manu (VIII. 413) viz. that he was created by God for serving the brāhmaṇa, though it is doubtful whether this could be or was enforced. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 33–36 and pp. 154–164 for the position and disabilities of śūdras from the Vedic times up to the days of the Smṛtis. It should not, however, be supposed that all India had become Buddhist. Millions still remained Hindus. There was the danger and fear that with royal patronage and the attractive features of Buddha's teachings large masses might forsake their ancient faith.

The brāhmaṇas of the times when Buddhism was at its peak had to strive to keep the banner of the Vedic religion flying, to deprive Buddhism of its hold on the masses of the people and even on the intelligentsia and to make them stick to the old fold. Buddhism itself had changed a great deal in its ideals, doctrines sometime before the beginning of the Christian era and for centuries thereafter. Buddha's original doctrines were aimed at individual effort and salvation of the individual by his own effort and self-culture. Early Buddhist texts deny the existence of anything like a soul[1512] and find no place for

---

1511. Vide his eloquent Intro. to S. B. E. vol. XI. p. 142 ' Never in the history of the world had a scheme of salvation been put forth so simple in its nature, so free from any superhuman agency, so independent of, so even antagonistic to the belief in a soul, the belief in God, the hope for a future life. Buddha put forth deliberately the doctrine of a salvation to be found here in this life in an inward change of heart to be brought about by perseverance in a mere system of self-culture and of self-control. That system is called the Noble Eight-fold Path. '

1512. Vide ' Questions of Milinda ' (II. 3. 6) in S. B. E. vol. XXXV pp. 88–89 for a discussion of the doctrine that there is no soul and pp. 520, 71–77 for the Buddhist theory of *kamma* (karma) and for the theory that what is reborn is *nāma-rūpa* (name and form) and not the soul. The Saundarānanda (B. I. ed. 16. 28–29) says : 'दीपो यथा निर्वृतिमभ्युपेतो नैवावनिं गच्छति नान्तरिक्षम्। दिशं न कांचिद्विदिशं न कांचित् स्नेहक्षयात्केवलमेति शान्तिम्॥ एवं कृती निर्वृतिमभ्युपेतो नैव…कांचित् क्लेशक्षयात्केवलमेति शान्तिम्॥'.

the idea of God. Though Buddha spoke of *Nirvāṇa* he did not clearly define it nor does he specify the condition of the individual when he enters nirvāṇa. Aśvaghoṣa compares nirvāṇa to the extinction of a flame (Saundarananda, chap. XVI. 28–29). Because the doctrine of karma was deeply rooted in the popular mind at the time of Buddha, Buddhism took over that doctrine, which, to men who are not Buddhists, appears to be contradictory of the denial of the existence of a soul. The word 'Dhamma' is used in three senses in the Pāli 'Dhammapada' (which being mentioned in the questions of Milinda is earlier than the 2nd century B. C.) viz. (1) the truth or law preached by Buddha, (2) thing or form, (3) way or mode of life.

As stated above, the original Buddhism preached by the Buddha and his followers in the first century or two after his *parinirvāṇa* was more or less a strict ethical code for individuals who sought salvation from the misery of the world. The three central conceptions of very early Buddhism were the three refuges (or *ratnas*) Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha, the Four Noble Truths and the Eightfold Path. Gradually a new doctrine was evolved.[1513] It came to be thought that to care for one's own deliverance and spend all efforts thereon was rather selfish, that as the Buddha himself out of compassion for suffering humanity worked for forty-five years to lead men to salvation by his exhortations and sermons, so a Buddhist should prefer to put off his own deliverance, should work for the deliverance of his fellowmen out of compassion (*karuṇā*) for their miserable lot and in doing so should be ready to be born again and again, should not care for his own salvation and should not be afraid of *saṁsāra*. Those holding these latter views deified Buddha, taught that Buddhahood was attained by Siddhārtha after undergoing numerous births in doing service and rendering help to others and that this was a superior code of conduct (Mahāyāna, the Great Vehicle or Way) to the selfish code of salvation for an individual himself (which came to be called Hīnayāna, the lesser Vehicle or Way). This extra-regarding gospel of Mahāyāna was very attractive and won great support in most countries of Asia.[1514]

1513. H. Kern in his 'Manual of Buddhism' (in the Grundriss p. 122 holds that Mahāyānism is much indebted to the Bhagavad-gītā. Compare 'लभन्ते ब्रह्मनिर्वाणमृषयः ... सर्वभूतहिते रताः ॥' V. 25 with the Mahāyāna view.

1514. The number of Books on Buddhism is legion. For Mahāyāna Buddhism, vide 'An Introduction to Mahāyāna Buddhism' by W. M. McGovern (London, 1922); 'Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism' by Dr. M. N.

(*Continued on next page*)

This doctrine of Bodhisattvas (meaning 'beings destined to be enlightened') is not consistent with the gospel of Buddha as preached by him in his first sermon at Banaras. There is a difference of ideals between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. The original gospel relies on self-effort and moral regeneration and on the elimination of suffering and misery by the extinction of all passions and of hankerings or desires and of the desire of

---

(*Continued from last page*)

Dutt (1930); the 'Bodhisattva doctrine in Sanskrit Literature' by Dr. Har Dayal (Kegan Paul, London 1932); 'The path of the Buddha' ed. by Prof. Kenneth W. Morgan (New York, 1956) written by several scholars from different countries (for both Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna).

A few books for those who want to know more of Buddhism in general and of Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna are recommended here. 'The central conception of Buddhism' (London, 1923), 'the conception of Nirvāṇa' (Leningrad, 1927), 'Buddhist Logic' vol. I (1958), all by Th. Stcherbatsky; 'Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha' by J. G. Jennings (Oxford Un. Press, 1948); 'Creed of Buddha' by Edmond Homes (5th ed.); 'Introduction to Tantrik Buddhism' by Dr. Shashi Bhushan Das-Gupta (Cal. University, 1950), 'the Flame and the Light' by Hugh I. Faussett (London and New York, 1958); 'the Buddha and his Dhamma' by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar (1957) in which he refrains from considering Buddhist Texts except those in Pali; 'Comparative study of Buddhism and Christianity' by Prof. F. Masutani (Tokyo, 1957). The Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṅkāra of Asaṅga (ed. by Prof. S. Levi) summarises in two verses (I. 9–10) the points (five) on which the two schools are in conflict. It-sing's 'Records of the Buddhist religion' translated by Dr. J. Takakusu (Oxford, 1896) surprisingly enough states (p. 15) 'These two systems are perfectly in accord with the noble doctrine. Both equally conform to truth and lead us to Nirvāṇa'. Buddha at least ignored (if he did not positively deny) God, he denied the individual soul and Eternity, he did not emphasize the most vital Upaniṣad teaching viz. 'anando brahmeti vyajānāt'. He imagined salvation as a state of absolute quiescence and therefore regarded ordinary life as misery and asserted that salvation may be attained even in this very life. He did not claim to be God, but a human being. There are various kinds of Mahāyāna doctrines and great diversity of definitions. It may generally be said that works professing to teach Mahāyāna practically forsake the ideal of a human Buddha, preach the worship of Buddha and future Buddhas, and assert that Nirvāṇa cannot be attained by the ancient method, that salvation cannot come in this very life but after centuries and aeons of the practice of virtue and helping others.

Mantrayāna and Vajrayāna are said by some to be branches of Mahāyāna, about the latter of which a good deal will be said in the next section. According to Bhikṣu Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Vajrayāna (700–1200 A.D.) is a synonym of Mahāyāna (400–700 A. D.) and merely the ulterior development of it (vide p. 211 of the paper 'L' Origine du Vajrayāna et Les 84 Siddhas' in J. A. vol. 225 (1934) pp. 209–230.

life[1515] itself. Buddha's original teaching regarded it as a waste of time to ponder over such questions as 'Have I existed during the ages that are past or have I not? Shall I exist during the ages of the future? Do I after all exist or am I not?' The Sabbāsavasutta (9–13) says that a wise man walking in the noble eightfold path understands what things ought to be considered and what things ought not to be considered. Vide S.B.E. vol. XI. pp. 298–300. Buddhism brought half of Asia under its influence not only by its promise of salvation to all by self-help, but more so by its teachings of profound tenderness, of active charity, of goodness and gentleness. Mahāyāna laid great stress on doing good to all and on bhakti. Both the original teaching of Hīnayāna and the Mahāyāna teaching are attractive in their own way.

Buddhism insisted on the five *śīlas*[1516] that were binding on all Buddhists viz. prohibition of injury to and destruction of life, of theft, of sexual impurity, of lying and of intoxicating liquors. Five more precepts (which together with the preceding five were called Daśaśikṣāpadas) were added for Buddhist priests, viz. prohibition of eating at forbidden hours, of attending wordly amusements such as dancing, song, music and shows, of the use of unguents and ornaments, of the use of a large or ornamented couch and of the receiving of gold and silver. About the *śīlas* it is clear that they were adopted from the ancient Upaniṣadic and Dharmasūtra teachings. The Chāndogya narrates how Aśvapati, king of Kekaya, boasted before five great householders and theologians 'in my[1517] kingdom there is no thief, no miser, no drunkard, no man without a fire-altar in his house, no ignorant person, no adulterer, much less an adulteress'. The same Upaniṣad[1518] quotes an ancient verse 'a man who steals gold, who drinks liquor, who dishonours his guru's bed, who kills a brāhmaṇa—these four fall and a fifth also that associates with any one of these four.' It will be shown

---

1515. That destruction of desires is *nirvāṇa* is stated in Ratanasutta 14 and the simile mentioned is that of a lamp being extinguished (by lack of oil).

1516. Vide खुद्दकपाठ 2, दीघनिकाय (II. 43 p. 63) for the five śīlas and Kern's 'Manual of Indian Buddhism' p. 70.

1517. स ह प्रातः संजिहान उवाच न मे स्तेनो जनपदे न कदर्यो न मद्यपो नानाहिताग्नि-र्नाविद्वान्न स्वैरी स्वैरिणी कुतः । छा. उप. V. 11. 5.

1518. तदेष श्लोकः । स्तेनो हिरण्यस्य सुरां पिबंश्च गुरोस्तल्पमावसन्ब्रह्महा चैते पतन्ति चत्वारः पञ्चमश्चाचरंस्तैरिति । छा. उप. V. 10. 9.

a little later how *ahiṁsā* was emphasized even in the Upaniṣads. Thus *ahiṁsa*, non-stealing, sexual purity, truthfulness had already been emphasized in the oldest Upanisads. That an ascetic[1519] had to give up all property and beg for keeping body and soul together is made clear by Bṛ. Up. III. 5. 1 and IV. 4. 22, Jābālopaniṣad 5, Gautama III. 10–13, Vasistha X. The other five precepts for priests such as not receiving gold or silver or giving up unguents, flowers, dancing, singing and music are laid down by Gautama[1520] II. 19 and III. 4, Vasiṣṭha X. 6 &c. for Vedic students and ascetics. Vide H. Kern (in 'Manual of Indian Buddhism, Grundriss p. 70) who remarks that the superior morality for monks is nothing else but the rule of life for the *dvija* in the 4th *āśrama*, when he is a *yati* and all the details were taken from the Dharma-sūtras and Dharmaśāstras.

Ahiṁsā—The Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas lay great emphasis on ahiṁsā (not harming or giving pain to a living creature). *The Upanisads too emphasized* ahimsā. The Chāndogya[1521] does so in several passages. In III. 17. 4 it says 'tapas, charity, straight-forwardness, ahimsā, speaking the truth—these are the fees of this (sacrifice without ceremonial)'. While describing how the person who has attained true knowledge of the Self does not return (to this samsāra), the Chāndogya says that 'he causes no pain to any creature except at tīrthas'. The Bṛ. Up. (V. 2.) says how Prajāpati told the gods, the *asuras* and men that the sound *'da da da'* produced by thundering

---

1519. एतं वै तमात्मानं विदित्वा ब्राह्मणाः पुत्रैषणायाश्च वित्तैषणायाश्च लोकैषणायाश्च व्युत्थायाथ भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्ति। बृह. उप. III. 5. 1 (after the brāhmaṇas have gained knowledge of this Self, they abstain from desire for sons, desire for wealth and desire for the worlds and wander about as beggars); अथ परिव्राड् विवर्णवासा मुण्डोऽपरिग्रहः शुचिरद्रोही भैक्षणो ब्रह्मभूयाय भवतीति। जाबालोप. 5 quoted by शङ्कराचार्य on वेदान्तसूत्र II. 1. 3 and III. 4. 20.

1520. वर्जयेन्मधुमांसगन्धमाल्यदिवास्वप्नाभ्यञ्जनयानोपानच्छत्र-काम-क्रोधलोभमोहवाद-वादनस्नानदन्तधावनहर्षनृत्यगीतपरिवादभयानि॥ गौ. II.19; मुण्डोऽममोऽपरिग्रहः। वसिष्ठ X. 6. For the other śilas of priests, compare with गौतम II. 19 the following from दीघनिकाय (vol. I p. 64 Sāmañña-phala-sutta II. 45) 'विरतो विकालभोजना। नच्च-गीत-वादित-विसूकदस्सना पटिविरतो होति। माला-गन्ध-विलेपन-धारण-मण्डण-विभूसण ट्ठाणा पटिविरतो होति। उच्चासयन-महासयना पटिविरतो होति। जातरूप-रजतपटिग्गहणा पटिविरतो होति। आमक-मंस-पटिग्गहणा पटिविरतो होति।'

1521. अथ यत्तपो दानमार्जवमहिंसा सत्यवचनमिति ता अस्य दक्षिणाः। छा. उप. III. 17. 4; आचार्यकुलाद्वेदमधीत्य ...स्वाध्यायमधीयानो धार्मिकान्विदधदात्मनि सर्वेन्द्रियाणि संप्रतिष्ठाप्याहिंसन् सर्वभूतान्यन्यत्र तीर्थेभ्यः ...न च पुनरावर्तते। छा. उप. VIII. 15; तदेतत्त्रयं शिक्षेद्दमं दानं दयामिति। बृह. उप. V. 2.

clouds conveys to the gods the necessity of self-restraint (dama), to the asuras of compassion (dayā) and to men of charity (dāna). Gautama[1522] specifies eight virtues of the soul, the first of which is compassion for all beings and states that he who has the forty saṁskāras performed on him but does not possess the eight virtues does not secure absorption into *brahma*. The Ādiparva provides 'ahiṁsā is the highest dharma for all beings; therefore a brāhmaṇa should never harm (or give pain to) any being'. The words 'ahiṁsā paramo dharmaḥ' (ahiṁsā is the highest *dharma*) occur very frequently in the Mahābhārata[1523] (e. g. in Droṇaparva 192. 38, Śānti 265. 6, 329. 18, Anuśāsana 115, 25, 116. 38, Āśvamedhikaparva 28. 16–18, 43. 21). Śāntiparva (296. 22–24) enumerates thirteen virtues common to all men, of which freedom from cruelty and ahiṁsā are the first two. Vasiṣṭha IV. 4, Manu X. 63, Yāj. I. 122 prescribe certain virtues as necessary in men of all varṇas. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 10 notes 25–27.

A few examples of emphasis on ahiṁsā in the Purāṇas may be cited here. The Vāmanapurāṇa[1524] provides: *ahiṁsā*, truth-

---

1522. दया सर्वभूतेषु शान्तिरनसूया शौचमनायासो मङ्गलमकार्पण्यमस्पृहेति। यस्यैते चत्वारिंशत्संस्कारा न चाष्टावात्मगुणा न स ब्रह्मणः सायुज्यं सलोकतां गच्छति। गौ. ध. सू. VIII. 24–25. The मत्स्य (52. 8–11) sets out these very ātmaguṇas that Gautama mentions; vide also मार्कण्डेय 25. 32–33 for almost the same eight guṇas including ahiṁsā.

1523. अहिंसा परमो धर्मः सर्वप्राणभृतां वर। तस्मात्प्राणभृतः सर्वान्न हिंस्याद् ब्राह्मणः क्वचित्॥ आदिपर्व 11. 13–14; अहिंसा सर्वभूतेषु धर्मं ज्यायस्तरं विदुः। द्रोण 192. 38; अहिंसा सर्वभूतेभ्यो धर्मेभ्यो ज्यायसी मता। शान्ति 265. 6; न हिंस्यात्सर्वभूतानि मैत्रायणगतश्चरेत्। शान्ति 329. 18; अहिंसा परमो धर्मस्तथाहिंसा परं तपः। अहिंसा परमं सत्यं यतो धर्मः प्रवर्तते॥ अनुशासन 115. 25; अहिंसा परमो धर्मो हिंसा चाधर्मलक्षणा। आश्वमेधिक 43. 21.

1524. अहिंसा सत्यमस्तेयं दानं क्षान्तिर्दमः शमः। अकार्पण्यं च शौचं च तपश्च रजनीचर। दशाङ्गो राक्षसश्रेष्ठ धर्मोऽसौ सार्ववर्णिकः॥ वामन 14. 1–2; न वेदैर्न च दानैश्च न तपोभिर्न चाध्वरैः। कथंचित् स्वर्गतिं यान्ति पुरुषाः प्राणिहिंसकाः। अहिंसा परमो धर्मो ह्यहिंसैव परं तपः। अहिंसा परमं दानमित्याहुर्मुनयः सदा। मशकान् सरीसृपान् दंशान्यूकाद्यान्मानवांस्तथा। आत्मौपम्येन पश्यन्ति मानवा ये दयालवः॥ पद्म I. 31. 26–28; these verses are repeated in पद्म VI. 243. 69–71 (reads मशकान्मत्कुणान् and आत्मौपम्येन रक्षन्ति); तस्माच्च हिंसां यज्ञं च प्रशंसन्ति महर्षयः। उञ्छो मूलं फलं शाकमुदपात्रं तपोधनाः। एतद्दत्त्वा विभवतः स्वर्गलोके प्रतिष्ठिताः। अद्रोहश्चाप्यलोभश्च दमो भूतदया शमः॥ ब्रह्मचर्यं तपः शौचमनुक्रोशं (शः?) क्षमा धृतिः। सनातनस्य धर्मस्य मूलमेतद्दुरासदम्॥ मत्स्य 143. 30–32; ब्रह्माण्ड II. 31. 36–38 are the same as मत्स्य (except that it reads तस्माच्च यज्ञं दानं वा) 143. 30–32. The verses उञ्छं मूलं फल'''मूलमेतत्सनातनम् *occur in* आश्वमेधिकपर्व 91. 32–34. For the words सनातनधर्म, vide the *Khanapur plates of* Mādhavavarman in E. I. vol. 27 p. 312 at p. 317 (श्रुतिस्मृतिविहितसनातनधर्मकर्मनिरताय) edited by Prof. V. V. Mirashi who assigns it to the 6th century A. D.

fulness, absence of stealing, charity, forbearance, self-control, quiescence of senses, absence of poor spirit or weakness, purity, *tapas*—this is the tenfold dharma applicable to all varṇas. The Padma says : not by (the study of) the Vedas, nor by gifts nor by *tapas*, nor by sacrifices do men who kill creatures reach the goal of *heaven* ; ahiṁsā is the highest dharma, the highest *tapas* and the highest charity—this is what the sages always say ; men that are compassionate treat flies, reptiles, stinging insects, lice and the like and human beings as themselves. Matsya goes so far as to state ; great sages do not commend sacrifice in which there is killing ; by donating grains of corn gathered in a field, roots, fruits, vegetables, vessel for carrying water according to their ability, sages practising austerities became established in heaven ; absence of hatred and greed, self-restraint, compassion towards all beings, control of senses, celibacy, tapas, tenderness, forbearance and firmness—this is the root of the ancient dharma, which is difficult to accomplish. The Brahmāṇḍa (II. 31. 35 'tasmād-ahiṁsā dharmasya dvāram-uktam maharṣibhiḥ') says that great sages have declared that ahiṁsā is the door of dharma. The Padma (V. 43. 38) says 'there is no *dāna* nor *tapas* equal to ahiṁsā'. It is interesting to note that the Matsya and Brahmāṇḍa regard ahiṁsā as 'sanātana dharma' and condemn animal sacrifices. The Kūrma[1525] provides 'ahiṁsā, truthfulness, non-stealing, celibacy and non-possession of wealth-these are briefly declared *yamas* that produce purity of mind among men. The great sages declare that *ahiṁsā* consists in causing no pain to all beings at all times by thought, word or

---

1525. अहिंसा सत्यमस्तेयं ब्रह्मचर्यापरिग्रहौ । यमाः संक्षेपतः प्रोक्ताश्चित्तशुद्धिप्रदा नृणाम् ॥ कर्मणा मनसा वाचा सर्वभूतेषु सर्वदा । अक्लेशजननं प्रोक्ता त्वहिंसा परमर्षिभिः ॥ अहिंसायाः परो धर्मो नास्त्यहिंसापरं सुखम् । विधिना या भवेद्धिंसा त्वहिंसैव प्रकीर्तिता ॥ कूर्म II. 11. 13–15. The लिङ्गपुराण (chap. 8. 8–9) enumerates the eight *sādhanas* of योग of which यम is first and mentions five as in कूर्म. Yamas (abstinences) are variously enumerated. Kūrma appears to follow the योगसूत्र II. 30–31 'अहिंसा-सत्य-अस्तेय-ब्रह्मचर्यापरिग्रहा यमाः । शौच-सन्तोष-तपः-स्वाध्याय-ईश्वरप्रणिधानानि नियमाः ।'. Manu IV. 204 provides generally that one should always practise yamas and that one may not always practise the niyamas, but does not name them, Medhātithi explains that yamas are prohibitions (viz. not to injure life, not to steal, not to tell an untruth, not to have forbidden sexual intercourse and not to possess wealth that belongs to another or not to accept gifts), while niyamas consist of positive acts, such as one should always study the Veda (as in Manu IV. 147). Yāj. III. 312–313 enumerates ten *yamas* viz. celibacy, compassion, forbearance, charity, absence of crooked conduct, *ahiṁsā*, non-stealing, sweetness, restraint of senses and ten niyamas. The वैखानस-स्मार्तसूत्र (IX. 4) enumerates ten yamas.

deed. There is no dharma superior to ahiṁsā, no happiness higher than (the practice of) ahiṁsā; the injury (to life) that is caused according to (Vedic) precepts is declared to be ahiṁsā.' The Upaniṣads commended a qualified ahiṁsā, while the original Pali books like the Sāmañña-phala-sutta forbad injury to all living beings. Most of the Purāṇas, in order to convince the masses that they did not lag behind the Buddhist preachings, generally insist upon unqualified ahiṁsā. Time brings about strange changes. Professing Buddhists in Ceylon, China, Japan and many other countries have no objection to partaking of fish and meat, while following the insistent advice of the Purāṇas, millions of Indian people (not only brāhmaṇas but also others like vaiśyas and śūdras if Vaiṣṇavas) have been strict vegetarians for centuries, though Buddhism vanished from India centuries ago.

It may be noted, however, that some of the Purāṇas are against carrying the doctrine of ahiṁsā to extremes. The Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu both say that there is no sin, great or small, in killing a person (e. g. a tyrant or a desperado), when many will live in happiness by his death.[1526]

Pūrta—The Purāṇas lay the greatest emphasis on what is called *pūrtadharma*, works of public utility, charity, social service and the relief of the poor and distressed. The word Iṣṭāpūrta occurs in the Ṛgveda once[1527] 'May you be united in the highest heaven with your pitṛs (ancestors), with Yama and with iṣṭāpūrta' (merit acquired by sacrifices and works of public utility). The word *iṣṭa* occurs several times in Ṛg. (I. 162. 15, I. 164. 15, X. 11. 2, X. 82. 2), but the meaning is not certain except in Ṛg. X. 11. 2 where it appears to mean 'sacrifice'. *Pūrta* also occurs in Ṛg. VI. 16. 18 and VIII. 46. 21, but the meaning is not certain. 'Iṣṭāpūrta' occurs in several Upaniṣads.

1526. यस्मिंस्तु निहते भद्रे जीवन्ते बहवः सुखम्। तस्मिन् हते नास्ति शुभे पातकं चोपपातकम्॥ ब्रह्माण्ड II. 36. 188, वायु 69. 162 (reads लभन्ते for जीवन्ते). The ब्रह्मपुराण 141.22 has the same idea in different words 'यस्मिन्निपातिते सौख्यं बहूनामुपजायते। सुनयस्तद्वधं प्राहुरश्वमेधशताधिकम्॥'. The कल्पतरु (गृहस्थकाण्ड) p. 300 quotes the verse from वायु (with slight variations viz. एधन्ते for जीवन्ते). The editor was unable to trace it. The verse should be read as निहते भद्रे and not निहतेऽभद्रे as it is printed on p. 300.

1527. संगच्छस्व पितृभिः सं यमेनेष्टापूर्तेन परमे व्योमन्। ऋ. X. 14. 8; इष्टस्य मध्ये अदितिर्नि धातु नो भ्राता नो ज्येष्ठः प्रथमो वि वोचति॥ ऋ. X. 11. 2.

The Chāndogya states[1528] 'But they who, living in a village, practise (a life of) sacrifices, works of public utility and alms-giving reach toward smoke &c.'. Similarly, the Praśna-upaniṣad asserts 'those, who practise the (mode of) sacrifices and works of public utility as activities to be engaged in, reach only the world of the Moon, and it is these that again return to this world'. The Muṇḍaka says 'deluded people regarding sacrifices and works of public utility as the best do not know (recognize) any other higher good; having enjoyed (their reward) on the top of heaven, they again enter this world or even a lower one'.[1529] Manu speaks of 'iṣṭa' and 'pūrta' and recommends that one should always practise with a pleased heart sacrificial gifts and gifts of the pūrta kind according to one's ability on securing a deserving brāhmaṇa. The Amarakośa defines 'iṣṭa' as sacrifices and 'pūrta' as works such as digging a well or tank. The Mārkaṇḍeya[1530] defines them as follows 'Maintaining the sacred fires, tapas, truthfulness, study of the Veda, hospitality and Vaiśvadeva–these are called iṣṭa; digging wells and tanks and building temples and distribution of food to those that need it — these are declared to be pūrta. The Agnipurāṇa has similar verses. The Padma (VI. 243. 10–14) cites the following as dharmakārya (religious works); temples of Viṣṇu and Śiva, tanks, wells, lotus ponds, forest of vaṭa, pippala, mango, kakkola, jambu and nimba trees, flower garden, distribution of food from morning to sunset, water distribution outside towns &c. The Skanda[1531] says: the term 'pūrta' is applied in the dharmaśāstras to the erection of temples, construction of tanks, ponds and wells, laying out parks. Padma (VI. 244. 34–35) says that those who build monasteries, cow stables, houses of rest on roads,

---

1528. अथ य इमे ग्राम इष्टापूर्ते दत्तमित्युपासते ते धूममभिसम्भवन्ति धूमाद्रात्रिम् &c छा. उप. V. 10. 3; तद्ये ह वै तदिष्टापूर्ते कृतमित्युपासते ते चान्द्रमसमेव लोकमभिजयन्ते। त एव पुनरावर्तन्ते। प्रश्न I. 9; इष्टापूर्तं मन्यमाना वरिष्ठं नान्यच्छ्रेयो वेदयन्ते प्रमूढाः। नाकस्य पृष्ठे ते सुकृतेऽनुभूत्वेमं लोकं हीनतरं चाविशन्ति॥ मुण्डकोप० I. 2. 10.

1529. दानधर्मं निषेवेत नित्यमैष्टिकपौर्तिकम्। परितुष्टेन भावेन पात्रमासाद्य शक्तितः॥ मनु. IV. 227; त्रिष्वथ क्रतुकर्मेष्टं पूर्तं खातादिकर्मणि। अमरकोश.

1530. अग्निहोत्रं तपः सत्यं वेदानां चैव साधनम्। आतिथ्यं वैश्वदेवं च इष्टमित्यभिधीयते॥ वापीकूपतडागानि देवतायतनानि च। अन्नप्रदानमर्थिभ्यः पूर्तमित्यभिधीयते॥ मार्कण्डेय 16. 123–124; अग्नि 209. 2–3 (reads चानुपालनं, च माहुरिष्टं च नाकदम्, अन्नप्रदानमारामाः पूर्तं धर्मं च मुक्तिदम्). The verse वापीकूप० is q. by अपरार्क pp. 24, 290 as from महाभारत. The above two are अत्रिसंहिता 43–44 (Ānan.).

1531. सुरालयसरोवापीकूपारामादिकल्पना। एतदर्थं हि पूर्ताख्या धर्मशास्त्रेषु निश्चिता॥ स्कन्द X. 2. 10.

dwellings for ascetics, cottages for the poor and helpless, extensive house for Veda study, houses for brāhmaṇas, enter the world of Indra (i. e. heaven). Atri says[1532] that Iṣṭa and Pūrta are dharma common to all *dvijas*; a śūdra is entitled to perform pūrta-dharmas but not Vaidika rites (i. e. sacrifices). The Anuśāsana-parva (chap. 58) describes how parks should be laid out and tanks constructed with trees on their banks. But the Varāhapurāṇa and some smṛtis went so far as to declare that a man secures only heaven by *iṣṭa*, but he secures mokṣa (final release from saṁsāra) by pūrta[1533].

Sometimes the Purāṇas express ideas that might strike us as rather modern, when they put forward social service and removal of suffering and distress as the highest dharma. In the Mārkaṇḍeya[1534] a king solemnly states 'men do not obtain that happiness in heaven or in the world of Brahmā, which springs from giving relief to distressed beings. Sacrifices, gifts, *tapas* do not conduce to the relief here and in the next world of that man whose heart is not set on relieving the distressed'. The Viṣṇu recommends 'a wise man should say (and do) that alone by thought, word and deed which would be for the benefit of creatures here and hereafter'. The Skanda-purāṇa (Kāśīkhaṇḍa) avers 'adversities of those good men in whose heart doing good to others is awake (i. e. active) vanish and prosperity comes to them at every step. That purity is not secured by baths at holy places, that reward is not obtained by numerous gifts, that (result) is not obtained by severe austerities, that is obtained by doing good to others. After churning all extensive dicta the conclusion reached is this viz. there is no dharma higher than doing good to others and there is no sin greater than harming

---

1532. इष्टापूर्तौ द्विजातीनां सामान्यौ धर्मसाधनौ। अधिकारी भवेच्छूद्रः पूर्ते धर्मे न वैदिके। अत्रि verse 46. On p. 24 अपरार्क quotes this from जातूकर्ण्य (reads धर्मौ सामासिकौ मतौ). Vide अपरार्क p. 290 for quotations from नारद in which the illustrations of Iṣṭa and Pūrta are given.

1533. इष्टापूर्तं द्विजातीनां प्रथमं धर्मसाधनम्। इष्टेन लभते स्वर्गं पूर्ते मोक्षं च विन्दति। वराह 172. 33, यमस्मृति 68, अत्रिसंहिता 145.

1534. न स्वर्गे ब्रह्मलोके वा तत्सुखं प्राप्यते नरैः। यदार्तजन्तुनिर्वाणदानोत्थमिति मे मतिः॥ यज्ञदानतपांसीह परत्र च न भूतये। भवन्ति तस्य यस्यार्तपरित्राणे न मानसम्॥ मार्कण्डेय 15. 57 and 62; प्राणिनामुपकाराय यथैवेह परत्र च। कर्मणा मनसा वाचा तदेव मतिमान् वदेत्॥ विष्णु III. 12. 45; परोपकरणं येषां जागर्ति हृदये सताम्। नश्यन्ति विपदस्तस्य सम्पदः स्युः पदे पदे॥ तीर्थस्नानैर्न सा शुद्धिर्बहुदानैर्न तत्फलम्। तपोभिरुग्रैस्तन्नाप्यमुपकृत्य यदाप्यते॥ परिनिर्मथ्य वाग्जालं निर्णीतमिदमेव हि। नोपकारात्परो धर्मो नापकारादघं परम्॥ स्कन्द, काशीखण्ड 6. 4–5 and 7; जीवितं सफलं तस्य यः परार्थोद्यतः सदा। अग्निरापो रविः पृथ्वी धान्यानि विविधानि च। परार्थं वर्तनं तेषां सतां चापि विशेषतः॥ ब्रह्म 125. 36–37.

others. The Brahma states 'the life of the man who always strives for the good of others is fruitful (blessed); fire, water, the Sun, the earth and various kinds of crops exist for the benefit of others, and particularly the good (exist for others' benefit)'.

It is surprising that the Bhāgavata avers what is in advance of modern socialistic doctrines 'men have ownership over only that much as would fill their belly; he who thinks as his own what is more than that is a thief and deserves punishment (as such).[1535]

Bhakti—The Purāṇas lay very great emphasis on bhakti (religion of loving faith in God). This is not the place to dilate on the history of the cult of *Bhakti* from the earliest times to modern days. For that purpose there are special treatises (some of which are noted below) that may be consulted. But a few words on bhakti in general may be said here before going into the question as to what the Purāṇas have to say thereon. Traces of the doctrine of *bhakti* may be discovered even in the Ṛgvedic hymns and mantras, some of which are full of loving faith in God, particularly in some of the hymns and verses addressed to Varuṇa and also to Indra. A few examples may be cited. 'All my thoughts[1536] (or hymns) praise Indra in unison, seeking light, longing for him, as wives embrace their husband, their fair young lover, they (thoughts) embrace him (Indra), the divine giver of gifts'; 'your friendship[1537] (with your devotee) is indestructible (everlasting); to him who desires a cow, you become a cow, to him who longs for a horse, may you be a horse;' 'O Indra, you are far better (or richer) than my father or my brother who does not feed me; (you) and my mother, O Vasu, are equal and protect (me) for (conferring) riches and favours'; 'You gave to Kakṣīvat, who offered a hymn and Soma libation to you and who had grown old, Vṛcayā, who was a young

---

1535. यावद् भ्रियेत जठरं तावत्स्वत्वं हि देहिनाम्। अधिकं योऽभिमन्येत स स्तेनो दण्डमर्हति॥ भागवत VII, 14. 8.

1536. अच्छा म इन्द्रं मतयः स्वर्विदः सध्रीचीर्विश्वा उशतीरनूषत। परिष्वजन्ते जनयो यथा पतिं मर्यं न शुन्ध्युं मघवानमूतये॥ ऋ. X. 43. 1; compare Ṛg. I. 62. 11 for the simile.

1537. दूणाशं सख्यं तव गौरसि गव्यते। अश्वो अश्वायते भव॥ ऋ. VI. 45. 26; वस्याँ इन्द्रासि मे पितुरुत भ्रातुरभुञ्जतः। माता च मे छदयथः समा वसो वसुत्वनाय राधसे॥ ऋ. VIII. 1. 6; असौ य एषि वीरको गृहं गृहं विचाकशत्। इमं जम्भसुतं पिब धानावन्तं करम्भिणमपूपवन्तमुक्थिनम्॥ ऋ. VIII. 91. 2; मेनाभवो वृषणश्वस्य सुक्रतो विश्वेत्ता ते सवनेषु प्रवाच्या॥ ऋ. I. 51. 13.

woman; you became the wife of Vṛṣaṇaśva; all these (favours) of yours deserve to be loudly proclaimed during the offerings of soma libations'; 'you who, shining brilliantly, come to each house assuming the form of a small man, (O Indra!) drink this Soma juice (produced) by being crushed with my teeth and mixed with fried grains, gruel, cake and laud'. Compare Ṛg. III. 43. 4, X. 42. 11, X. 112. 10 (in all of which Indra is called 'sakhā' friend) and I. 104. 9, VII. 32. 26 (in both Indra is said to be like a father). It will be clear from these passages that the Vedic sages had reached the stage of *sakhya-bhakti*, that the sages believed that Indra was like a mother, that he assumed the form of a wife for the sake of a devotee, that Indra partook *soma* juice from a devotee who, in the absence of the proper implements for crushing soma stalks, extracted soma juice from soma stalks crushed with the devotee's own teeth. These stories in the far-off ages of the Ṛgveda remind us of the stories in the works of the medieval ages about Rāma having accepted *badara* fruit from a Śabarī (Bhil woman) devotee who first tasted them with her teeth to see whether they were sweet or sour and the story of the God Viṭhobā of Pandharpur, having assumed the form of a *mahār* (an untouchable) and paid up to the Moslem king of Bijapur the money equivalent to the price of corn which, Dāmāji (a great devotee), who was in charge of the royal granary, allowed people distressed by famine to take away. Some mantras addressed to Varuṇa show the same kind of *sakhya-bhakti*. Vasiṣṭha[1537a] prays 'O Varuṇa! what is that great offence (committed by me) on account of which you desire to harm me, your friend and bard; declare that to me, O invincible and self-willed God, so that (after propitiating you) I shall be free from sin and may be able quickly to approach you with adoration'; 'where are those friendships of ours (of you and me) which we safely enjoyed in former times, O self-willed Varuṇa?; I (then) went to your big dwelling house that has a thousand doors; whatever offence we mortals commit against the divine hosts, O Varuṇa, whatever laws of yours we may have violated in our ignorance (or heedlessness), do not, O God, harm us on account of that sin'. It is remarkable that in the Ṛgveda there is a verse in which

---

1537 a. किमाग आस वरुण ज्येष्ठं यत्स्तोतारं जिघांससि सखायम्। प्र तन्मे वोचो दूळभ स्वधावोऽव त्वानेना नमसा तुर इयाम्॥ ऋ. VII. 86. 4; क्व त्यानि नौ सख्या बभूवुः सचावहे यदवृकं पुरा चित्। बृहन्तं मानं वरुण स्वधावः सहस्रद्वारं जगमा गृहं ते॥ ऋ. VII. 88. 5; यत्किंचेदं वरुण दैव्ये जनेऽभिद्रोहं मनुष्याश्चरामसि। अचित्ती यत्तव धर्मा युयोपिम मा नस्तस्मादेनसो देव रीरिषः॥ ऋ. VII. 89. 5.

there is an apotheosis[1538] of 'namas' (*namaskāra*, adoration or homage); 'Adoration itself is mighty, I offer service with adoration; adoration upholds the heaven and the earth; adoration to the gods, adoration rules these gods, whatever sin is committed (by me) I worship it away with adoration'.

Though the word 'bhakti' does not occur in the principal ancient Upaniṣads, the doctrine of the bhakti schools that it is God's grace alone that saves the devotee is found in the Kaṭha and Muṇḍaka Upaniṣads, viz. 'this Supreme Soul is not to be attained by expositions (of a teacher) nor by intelligence, nor by much learning; He is to be attained by him alone whom the Supreme Soul favours, to him this Supreme Soul discloses His form.'[1539] This emphasizes the doctrine that God's Grace alone brings salvation to the devotee. The Śvetāśvataropaniṣad employs the word *bhakti* in the same sense in which it is used in the Gītā and[1540] other works on bhakti. 'These matters declared (here) reveal themselves to that high-souled person who has the highest faith in God and the same faith in his *guru* as in God'. The same Upaniṣad emphasizes a doctrine of the bhakti school in 'I, desirous of mokṣa (liberation from saṁsāra), surrender myself as my refuge to that God who in former times created (established) Brahmā, who transmitted to him (Brahmā) the Vedas, and who illuminates the intellect of the individual soul'.

The word 'prapadye' in the Śvetāśvatara serves as the basis of the doctrine of 'prapatti' in the Vaiṣṇavite system such as that of Rāmānuja.

But among the original sources of the Bhakti cult are the Nārāyaṇīya section (chapters 335–351 of Citraśāla ed. = cr. ed. 322–339) of the Śāntiparva and the Bhagavadgītā. For the

---

1538. नम इदुग्रं नम आ विवासे नमो दाधार पृथिवीमुत द्याम्। नमो देवेभ्यो नम ईश एषां कृतं चिदेनो नमसा विवासे॥ ऋ. VI. 51. 8.

1539. नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन। यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यस्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनूं स्वाम्। कठोप० 2. 22, मुण्डक III. 2. 3.

1540. यस्य देवे परा भक्तिर्यथा देवे तथा गुरौ। तस्यैते कथिता ह्यर्थाः प्रकाशन्ते महात्मनः॥ श्वेताश्व. VI. 23; यो ब्रह्माणं विदधाति पूर्वं यो वै वेदांश्च प्रहिणोति तस्मै। तं ह देवमात्मबुद्धिप्रकाशं मुमुक्षुर्वै शरणमहं प्रपद्ये॥ श्वेताश्व. VI. 18. This last verse is relied upon by स्वप्नेश्वर in his bhāṣya on शाण्डिल्य-भक्तिसूत्र I. 1. 1. Barth in his 'Religions of India' translated by J. Wood (3rd ed. 1891) sets out the grounds on which western scholars (particularly Weber) held that the religion of loving faith in Kṛṣṇa was due to Christian influence and then states that he is not satisfied with this theory (pp. 219–223).

antiquity of Kṛṣṇa worship (vide pp. 129-131 above). Megasthenes states that Heracles (Harikṛṣṇa ?) was worshipped by Soursenoi (Śaurasenas) on the banks of Jobares (Yamunā) and had two cities Methora (Mathurā) and Cleisbora (Kṛṣṇapura ?). In the Nārāyaṇīya it is stated (in chap. 335. 17-24) that king Uparicara Vasu was a devotee (bhakta) of Nārāyaṇa, that he worshipped the Lord of Gods according to the *sāttvata* rules that were proclaimed by the Sun, that he (Vasu) consecrated his kingdom, wealth, wife and horses to God, thinking that they all belonged to the Bhagavat (the Adorable One) and performed sacrificial rites according to the Sāttvata rules.

In the Śāntiparva, Sātvata and Pāñcarātra are identified[1541] and it is said that the seven sages called 'citraśikhaṇḍin' (lit. whose top-knots on the head were bright or wonderful) viz. Marīci, Atri, Angiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vasiṣṭha, proclaimed the (Pāñcarātra) śāstra and God Nārāyaṇa told them that the śāstra would be authoritative in the world and that king Vasu would learn the śāstra from Bṛhaspati to whom it would come by degrees from the seven sages. Chapter 336 of Śānti declares that to the north of the Milky Sea there was territory called Śvetadvīpa, where dwelt devotees of Nārāyana who were called[1542] 'Ekāntin' and Pāñcarātra is called 'Ekānta-dharma'. A peculiar doctrine of the Pāñcarātra school is that of the four *vyūhas* (*mūrtis* or forms) viz. that the Supreme Person is Vāsudeva, the individual soul is Sānkarṣana, Pradyuma is mind and springs from Saṅkarsaṇa and Aniruddha is *ahaṅkāra* and originates from Pradyumna.[1543] It is this doctrine of the four forms of Vāsudeva, each springing from the preceding, that is refuted according to Śaṅkara in the Brahmasūtra II. 2. 42-45. The Śānti 348. 8 expressly refers to the Gītā as already declared

1541. काम्यनैमित्तिका राजन् यज्ञियाः परमक्रियाः । सर्वाः सात्वतमास्थाय विधिं चक्रे समाहितः । पाञ्चरात्रविदो मुख्यास्तस्य गेहे महात्मनः । प्रायणं भगवत्प्रोक्तं भुञ्जते वाग्रभोजनम् ॥ शान्ति 335. 24-25.

1542. एकान्तिनस्ते पुरुषाः श्वेतद्वीपनिवासिनः । शान्ति 336. 29; vide also शान्ति 348. 62 for एकान्तिनः पुरुषाः; एकान्तिनस्ते पुरुषा गच्छन्ति परमं पदम् । नूनमेकान्तधर्मोऽयं श्रेष्ठो नारायणप्रियः ॥ शान्ति 348. 3-4.

1543. यो वासुदेवो भगवान् क्षेत्रज्ञो निर्गुणात्मकः । ज्ञेयः स एव राजेन्द्र जीवः सङ्कर्षणः प्रभुः ॥ सङ्कर्षणाच्च प्रद्युम्नो मनोभूतः स उच्यते । प्रद्युम्नाद्योऽनिरुद्धस्तु सोऽहङ्कारः स ईश्वरः ॥ शान्ति° 339. 40-41.

to Arjuna. In[1544] chap. 349. 64 it is said that Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Pāñcarātra, Vedas and Pāśupata are five lores that differ in their views and were promulgated by Kapila (Sāṅkhya), Hiraṇyagarbha (Yoga), Apāntaratamas (the Veda), Śiva (Pāśupata), the Bhāgavat Himself (promulgator of Pāñcarātra). The Viṣṇudharmottara[1545] remarks 'for seeking Brahma (the One Reality in the Universe) there are five Siddhāntas (systems) viz. Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Pāñcarātra,[1546] Vedas and Pāśupata'. Relying on Śāntiparva 339. 68 several writers particularly those of the Rāmānuja school assert that the whole of the Pāñcarātra system has Vedic

---

1544. सांख्यं योगः पाञ्चरात्रं वेदाः पाशुपतं तथा । ज्ञानान्येतानि राजर्षे विद्धि नानामतानि वै ॥. शान्ति 349. 64; but later on it is said सांख्यस्य वक्ता कपिलः परमर्षिः स उच्यते । ...उक्तवानिदमव्यग्रो ज्ञानं पाशुपतं शिवः । पाञ्चरात्रस्य कृत्स्नस्य वेत्ता तु भगवान् स्वयम् । सर्वेषु च नृपश्रेष्ठ ज्ञानेष्वेतेषु दृश्यते ॥ शान्ति 349. 65–68 q. by परिभाषाप्रकाश p. 21 (which reads वक्ता तु भगवान् स्वयम्). These verses are borrowed almost verbatim by the योगियाज्ञवल्क्य XII. 5–6 and the same work reads 'सांख्यं योगं ...तथा । अतिप्रमाणान्येतानि हेतुभिर्न विचालयेत् ।' XII. 4 (q. by अपरार्क on p. 11), which means that the five systems are beyond the ordinary means of knowledge and they should not be disturbed by mere ratiocination.

1545. सांख्यं योगं पञ्चरात्रं शैवं पाशुपतं तथा । कृतान्तपञ्चकं विद्धि ब्रह्मणः परिमार्गणे ॥ विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपु० I. 74. 34 q. by हे. on व्रत vol. I. p. 25 and परिभाषाप्रकाश p. 22.

1546. Why the cult of Vāsudeva was called Pāñcarātra has not been satisfactorily explained anywhere in the English Histories of Indian Philosophy so far as I know. The name leads to the inference that the cult has something to do with *five* matters. But why is the word *rātra* or *kāla* used? That is the difficulty. In Śānti 336. 46 (cr. ed. 323. 42) Pañcarātra is referred to as 'Pañcakāla' (तैरिष्टः पञ्चकालज्ञैर्हरिरेकान्तिभिर्नरैः). Several guesses have been put forward, some of which are: (1) on five nights Nārāyaṇa taught Ananta, Garuḍa, Viśvaksena, Brahmā and Rudra; (2) The Parama-saṁhitā (31. 19) states that God imparted this doctrine in five nights to four sages, Sanatkumāra, Sanaka, Sanandana and Sanātana; (3) this cult blackened (*rātri* is dark) five teachings, viz. सांख्य, योग, पाशुपत, बौद्ध and आर्हत; (4) this (pāñcarātra) teaches five aspects पर, व्यूह, विभव (i. e. अवतार), अन्तर्यामिन्, अर्चा (images); (5) it dwells upon five duties of Vaiṣṇavas viz. tāpa (branding on the arm and other limbs), puṇḍra (upright lines made on the forehead with some colouring substance), nāma (names of Vāsudeva), mantra (like 'Om namo Nārāyaṇāya), yāga (worship of images of Vāsudeva). The Ālwar literature mentions fivefold nature viz. Para and the others. Vide K. C. Varadachari's paper on 'Some contributions of Ālwars to the philosophy of bhakti' in Silver Jubilee vol. of BORI, p. 621. The Paramasaṁhitā (I. 39–40 G. O. S. ed.) states that the five great Elements, the five Tanmātras, Ahaṁkāra, Buddhi and *avyakta*, (five categories or Tattvas of the Sāṅkhya) are the night (as it were) of the Puruṣa and therefore this śāstra (which propounds how to be free from the meshes of these five) is called Pāñcarātra.

authority, while others like Aparārka p. 13 and Paribhāṣāprakāśa (p. 23) do not accept it as thoroughly Vedic but only partially.

In the Vedāntasūtra[1547] there are four sūtras dealing with the Bhāgavata or Pāñcarātra system. The great Ācāryas are not agreed upon their interpretation, Śaṅkara saying that all the four sūtras refute some tenets of the Bhāgavatas, Rāmānuja saying that the first two sūtras (out of four) contain refutation of the Bhāgavata doctrine and the other two do not. Śaṅkarācārya makes it clear that the doctrines of the Bhāgavatas that the Supreme God Vāsudeva is the Highest Truth, that He assumes four forms, that the worship of Vāsudeva consists in continuous single-minded contemplation of Vāsudeva are not the targets for attack, that what is refuted is the doctrine of the Bhāgavatas that the individual soul called Saṅkarṣaṇa by them springs from Vāsudeva, that Pradyumna (mind) arises from Saṅkarasaṇa and that Aniruddha (ahaṁkāra) arises from Pradyumna. It appears from Śaṅkara's remarks[1548] on II. 2. 45 that in his day Śāṇḍilya was supposed to have promulgated the Bhāgavata or Pāñcarātra śāstra, because he did not find the

---

1547. The four sūtras in the Vedāntasūtra (II. 2. 42–45) are : उत्पत्त्यसम्भवात्, न च कर्तुः करणम्, विज्ञानादिभावे वा तदप्रतिषेधः, विप्रतिषेधाच्च. Though Rāmānuja enlarges upon the Pāñcarātra doctrine in his comments on the last two sūtras out of these four and quotes three passages that may be called Pāñcarātra, he does not avow either in his Śrībhāṣya or in his Vedārtha-saṅgraha that he is a Sātvata or Pāñcarātra.

1548. वेदविप्रतिषेधश्च भवति । चतुर्षु वेदेषु परं श्रेयोऽलब्ध्वा शाण्डिल्य इदं शास्त्रमधिगतवानित्यादिवेदनिन्दादर्शनात् । शाङ्करभाष्य on वेदान्तसूत्र II. 2. 45. शङ्कराचार्य begins 'तत्र भागवता मन्यन्ते' (on ब्रह्मसूत्र II. 2. 42) and under II. 2. 44 he remarks 'न च पञ्चरात्रसिद्धान्तिभिर्वासुदेवादिष्वेकस्मिन् सर्वेषु वा ज्ञानैश्वर्यादितारतम्यकृतः कश्चिद्भेदोऽभ्युपगम्यते ।'. It may further he noted that in the Śāntiparva पाञ्चरात्र is called सात्वतधर्म (chap. 348. 34 and 84). बाण in his हर्षचरित (8th उच्छ्वास), while describing the persons professing various religious and philosophical doctrines gathered near the great ācārya Divākara-mitra, separately mentions Bhāgavatas and Pāñcarātrikas 'विटपच्छायासु निषण्णैः…भागवतैर्वर्णिभिः केशलुञ्चनैः कापिलैर्जैनलोकायतिकैः…पौराणिकैः साप्ततन्तवैः शैवैः शाब्दैः पाञ्चरात्रिकैरन्यैश्चात्र स्वान् स्वान् सिद्धान्ताञ् शृण्वद्भिः &c.'. What Bāṇa probably means is that भागवत stands for the general cult of bhakti (in the Gītā) and पाञ्चरात्र for one school among भागवतs, that had as its characteristic the doctrine of four vyūhas. This is like ब्राह्मणश्रमणन्याय. The वृद्धहारीतस्मृति (11. 181–192.) states that Śāṇḍilya composed a work for performing the worship of Viṣṇu by a non-Vedic procedure, that Viṣṇu cursed him to remain in hell but relented when Śāṇḍilya threw himself on his mercy and reduced the period of hell-residence.

highest bliss in all the four Vedas. In the Droṇaparva (29. 26–29) there is another and different reference to the four mūrtis of the Supreme for the benefit of the worlds viz. one performs tapas (asuterities) on the earth, the 2nd has an eye on the world's good and evil deeds; the third comes to the world in a human form and does such acts as men perform; the 4th slumbers for a thousand years and when it arises from slumber confers the highest boons on those who deserve them.

It may be noted that even in the Mahābhārata Nārada's name is connected with Pāñcarātra. It is said 'this very secret doctrine, connected with the four Vedas, having the benefit of Sāṅkhya and Yoga and spoken of as Pāñcarātra, was (originally) uttered by the lips of Nārāyaṇa and was again communicated by Nārada.[1549]

Other great sources of the cult of bhakti are the Bhagavadgītā, which is expressly mentioned in the Nārāyaṇīya section (348. 8 = cr. ed. 336. 8), the Bhāgavatapurāṇa and the Viṣṇupurāṇa. The Gītā contains the words *bhakti* and *bhakta* several dozens of times. It may be stated here that the so-called Nārada-bhaktisūtras, Nārada-pāñcarātra, the Śāṇḍilya-bhakti-sūtra and the several extant Pāñcarātra-saṁhitās so far published are all later than the Gītā.[1550] The Agnipurāṇa gives the names of 25 works on Pañcarātra quoted in the note below.[1551] The Maheśvara-

1549. इदं महोपनिषदं चतुर्वेदसमन्वितम् । सांख्ययोगकृतं तेन पञ्चरात्रानुशब्दितम् । नारायणमुखोद्गीतं नारदोऽश्रावयत्पुनः । शान्ति 339. 111–112 (=:cr. ed. 326. 100–101). The words इदं...शब्दितम् are q. by रामानुज in his भाष्य on ब्रह्मसूत्र II. 2. 45 (42 in रामानुजभाष्य B. S. S.).

1550. The reasons for this statement are not relevant to this work, but by way of example, attention may be drawn to some Śāṇḍilya-sūtras: तद्वेव कर्मिज्ञानियोगिभ्य आधिक्यशब्दात्, प्रश्ननिरूपणाभ्यामाधिक्यसिद्धेः (I. 2. 22–23 in Jivanand's ed. = I. 2. 15–16 in भक्तिचन्द्रिका), which clearly refer to Gītā VI. 46–47 and XII. 1 and 6–7 respectively. There is one sūtra where the Gītā is expressly mentioned viz. सैकान्तभावो गीतार्थप्रत्यभिज्ञानात् (II. 2. 83 in Jivanand's ed. = II. 2. 28 in भक्तिचन्द्रिका). स्वप्नेश्वर comments on this सा पराभक्तिरेवैकान्तभावो नान्यः । कुतः । गीतार्थेन प्रत्यभिज्ञाश्रवणात् । यथा नारायणीय एव 'सहोपनिषदो...ऋषिणापि वा' (शान्ति 348. 5–6) इति प्रश्ने प्रत्युत्तरम् । 'समुपोढेष्वनीकेषु... भगवता स्वयम् ।' (शान्ति 348. 8) । तस्मादेकान्तिता परा भक्तिरिति ।.

1551. विष्ण्वादीनां प्रतिष्ठादि वक्ष्ये ब्रह्मन् शृणुष्व मे । प्रोक्तानि पञ्चरात्राणि सप्तरात्राणि वै मया ॥ व्यस्तानि मुनिभिर्लोके पञ्चविंशतिसंख्यया । हयशीर्षं तन्त्रमाद्यं तन्त्रं त्रैलोक्यमोहनम् ॥ ...स्वायम्भुवं कापिलं च तार्क्ष्यं नारायणीयकम् ॥ आत्रेयं नारसिंहाख्यमानन्दाख्यं तथारुणम् ॥ बौधायनं तथाष्टाङ्गं विश्वोक्तं तस्य सारतः ॥ अग्निपु० 39. 1–5. Does नारायणीयक in the verse above refer to the नारायणीय section of the महाभारत ?

tantra names 25 Pāñcarātra tantras promulgated by Viṣṇu, which are condemned therein as having no truth (26. 16 ff.).

There is an extensive Literature on the Bhakti cult. Only a few of the important works in Sanskrit, their translations and works in English are noted here. Barth, Hopkins, Keith, Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar and others have propounded different theories as to what Kṛṣṇa represented, how he was identified with Viṣṇu who appears to be another name of the Sun in the Ṛgveda and came to be regarded as the highest God in Brāhmaṇa times (as in Ait. Br. 'Agnir-vai devānām avamaḥ, Viṣṇuḥ paramaḥ) and came to be identified with sacrifice (Yajño vai Viṣṇuḥ). When Kṛṣṇa, the friend of the Pāṇḍavas was identified with the Supreme Spirit, the full-fledged doctrine of Avatāras appeared as in the Gītā. The important works on *bhakti* are: The Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śāntiparva (chapters 322–351 in the Citraśālā edition and chap. 322–339 of the critical edition); the Bhagavadgītā; several Purāṇas, the most important being Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata;[1552] the Bhaktisūtra of Śāṇḍilya with the *bhāṣya* of Svapneśvara (ed. by Jivananda, Calcutta 1876) and translation of both these (in B. I. series) by E. B. Cowell

---

1552. It is remarkable that the Bhāgavata, which is practically the most important or sole authority for all great medieval Vaiṣṇava teachers like Vallabha and Caitanya and their disciples, is not quoted anywhere by Rāmānuja (who was born in śake 1049 i. e. 1127 A. D.) in his bhāṣya on the Brahmasūtras, when he quotes over a hundred verses from the Viṣṇupurāṇa in the same. In fact, in the Vedārthsaṅgraha Rāmānuja states that in the same way as the section (anuvāka) on Nārāyaṇa among all śruti texts serves to expound the special aspect of highest Brahma so the Viṣṇupurāṇa also defines a special aspect of the highest Brahma and that all other Purāṇas should be so interpreted as not to be in conflict with it 'यथा सर्वासु श्रुतिषु केवलपरब्रह्मस्वरूपविशेषप्रकाशनायैव प्रवृत्तो नारायणानुवाकस्तथेदं वैष्णवं च पुराणं...परब्रह्मस्वरूपविशेषनिर्णयायैव प्रवृत्तम्। अन्यानि सर्वाणि पुराणान्येतदविरोधेन नेयानि। वेदार्थसंग्रह para 110–111 pp. 141–142 (D. C. ed. 1956). रामानुज mentions (in भाष्य on वेदान्तसूत्र II. 2. 41 and 45) पौष्करसंहिता, सात्वतसंहिता and परमसंहिता among the पाञ्चरात्रसंहिताs, but does nowhere affirm that he is a follower of the पञ्चरात्र doctrine. There are numerous commentaries on the Bhāgavata and commentaries on commentaries (Das Gupta in vol. 4 pp. 1–2 lists over 40 commentaries on the Bhāgavata). It is unnecessary in this work to refer to the numerous commentaries of the disciples and followers of Madhva and other great Vaiṣṇava ācāryas. The position of Vallabhācārya (1479–1531 A. D.) appears to be that the Bhāgavata is the supreme authority in case of doubt 'वेदाः श्रीकृष्णवाक्यानि व्याससूत्राणि चैव हि। समाधिभाषा व्यासस्य प्रमाणं तच्चतुष्टयम्। उत्तरं पूर्वसन्देहवारकं परिकीर्तितम्॥ तत्त्वदीपनिबन्ध (Ahmedabad, 1926); vide also Prof. G. H. Bhatt in I. H. Q. vol. IX, 300–306. Vallabhācārya's is called पुष्टिमार्ग (meaning कृष्णानुग्रह) and he holds that even *bhakti* is difficult to accomplish in the Kali age.

(1878); Śāṇḍilya's saṁhitā (Bhaktikhaṇḍa) in the Sarasvatībhavan Series, edited by Anantasastri Phadke, (1935); Nāradabhaktisūtra with English Translation by Nandlal Sinha (Pāṇini office, Allahabad, 1911); the Nārada-pāñcarātra (containing the Jñānāmṛtasāra section) in eleven chapters (ed. for B. I. Series by C. M. Banerji, Calcutta, 1865) and English translation of it by Swami Vijñānānanda (Pāṇini Office, Allahabad, 1921); Sir R. G. Bhadarkar's 'Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism &c.' (1913, in the Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research); 'Das-Gupta's History of Indian Philosophy' vol. IV. (1949), wherein he deals with the Bhāgavatapurāṇa and the doctrines of Madhva, Vallabha, Caitanya and their followers; Grierson's paper 'Gleanings from Bhaktamālā of Nābhādāsa', in J. R. A. S. for 1909 pp. 607–644; 'History of Śrīvaiṣṇavas', by T. A. Gopinatha Rao (Madras, 1923), 'the Gospel of Nārada' by Duncan Greenless (Adyar, 1951); Nārada-bhakti-sūtras (text, translation and notes) ed. by Swami Tyāgīśānanda (Ramakrisna Math, Mylapore, Madras, 1943) in five *adhyāyas* and 84 sūtras; the Ahirbudhnya-saṁhitā in two volumes (Adyar, 1916); Dr. F. Otto Schrader's Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and Ahirbudhnya-saṁhitā (Adyar, 1916); Jayākhya-saṁhitā with English and Sanskrit Introductions (G. O. S. 1931); the Parama-saṁhitā (G. O. S., 1946) with English Translation by Dr. S. K. Aiyangar; the Bṛhadbrahmasaṁhitā (of Nārada-pāñcarātra) in the Ānandāśrama series, 1912); Bhakticandrikā (commentary on Śāṇḍilya's Bhaktisūtras) by Nārāyaṇatīrtha (Sarasvatībhavan series, 1921, 1938); Bhaktiprakāśa of Mitramiśra (Chowkhamba Series, 1934); Bhaktinirṇaya of Anantadeva (ed. by Pandit Anantasastri Phadke, Banaras, 1937). There is a good deal of Bhakti literature in South India, such as the hymns of the Āḻwārs, but no reference is made here to it for several reasons.

Before proceeding with the treatment of *bhakti* in the Purāṇas the words 'bhakti' and 'Bhāgavata' must be briefly defined and explained. Śāṇḍilya defines[1553a] 'bhakti' as 'sā

1552a. अथातो भक्तिजिज्ञासा। सा परानुरक्तिरीश्वरे। शाण्डिल्य I. 1. 1–2; स्वप्नेश्वर comments: आराध्यविषयकरागत्वमेव सा। इह तु परमेश्वरविषयकान्तःकरणवृत्तिविशेष एव भक्तिः। The verse relied on is: या प्रीतिरविवेकानां विषयेष्वनपायिनी। त्वामनुस्मरतः सा मे हृदयान्मापसर्पतु॥ विष्णुपु० I. 20. 19. स्वप्नेश्वर also quotes गीता 'मच्चित्ता मद्गतप्राणा बोधयन्तः परस्परम्। कथयन्तश्च मां नित्यं तुष्यन्ति च रमन्ति च॥ तेषां सततयुक्तानां भजतां प्रीतिपूर्वकम्। ददामि बुद्धियोगं तं येन मामुपयान्ति ते॥ X. 9–10. On अनुरक्ति he remarks 'भगवन्महिमादिज्ञानादनु पश्चात् जायमानत्वादनुरक्तिरित्युक्तम्'. स्वप्नेश्वर refers

(*Continued on next page*)

parānuraktirīśvare'. This may be interpreted in two ways 'the highest form of bhakti is affection fixed on God' or 'bhakti is the highest affection fixed on God'. Svapneśvara, the author of a bhāṣya on Śāṇḍilya, prefers the first and Nārada-bhakti-sūtra, Tilak and others favour the second. Svapneśvara explains that in general 'bhakti' means 'affection fixed on a being that is to be won over or worshipped', but that in this śāstra it means 'a particular state of the mind having the Supreme Lord as its object' and quotes a verse from the Viṣṇupurāṇa uttered by the great devotee Prahlāda 'May that fixed (or unwavering) love, which the ignorant (or unreflecting) people feel for worldly objects, never depart from my heart, ever remembering you'. The Gītā employs the word 'prīti' (affection) and conveys that the word 'bhakti' is derived from the root 'bhaj' to resort to, 'Those whose minds are on me, whose lives are offered to me, who instruct each other, who speak of me, are always contented and happy. On these who are continuously devoted to me and serve me with affection, I bestow that knowledge by which they reach me'. Svapneśvara explains that the word 'anurakti' (with prefix 'anu') is employed to convey that the affection for God arises *after* the devotee secures knowledge of the greatness and other attributes of the Bhagavat (Adorable One). In the Viṣṇupurāṇa the word 'anurāga' is used for 'bhakti', where, after describing the ascent of Rāma and his brothers to heaven, it says that the people of the capital of Kosala who had deep affection for those incarnate parts of the Bhagavat (Viṣṇu), having their minds fixed on them, reached the position of residence in the same world with them. Śāṇḍilya further[1553] says that there is the teaching that there is immortality for him who abides in Him. In the Chāndogya Up. it is said 'He who abides in brahman reaches immortality'. The idea is that immortality being the promise of abiding in God, there will be no indifference in the effort to know God or in the effort to

---

(*Continued from last page*)

to विष्णुपुराण IV. 4. 103 'येपि तेषु भगवदंशेष्वनुरागिणः कोसलनगरजानपदास्तेपि तन्मनसस्तत्सालोक्यतामेवापुः'. The भागवत holds that the highest bhakti must be disinterested and uninterrupted; अहैतुक्यव्यवहिता या भक्तिः पुरुषोत्तमे। भागवत III. 29. 12. The next verse mentions the four stages of beatitude 'सालोक्यसार्ष्टिसामीप्यसायुज्यैकत्वमप्युत' (एकत्व is 5th, final goal).

1553. तत्संस्थस्यामृतत्वोपदेशात्। शाण्डिल्य I.1.30; स्वप्नेश्वर explains; 'तस्मिन्नीश्वरे संस्था भक्तिर्यस्य स तथोक्तः'. The छान्दोग्य declares 'ब्रह्मसंस्थोऽमृतत्वमेति' (II. 23.1) and the same meaning is conveyed by ब्रह्मसूत्र I. 1. 7 'तन्निष्ठस्य मोक्षोपदेशात्'.

cultivate highest affection for God. It may be noticed that the sūtras of Nārada appear to be a mere paraphrase of Śāṇḍilya's aphorisms.[1554] Śāṇḍilya further (sūtra 7) provides that bhakti, like knowledge, is not an action because it does not follow an effort of the will and that (sūtra 9) it is different from *jñāna*, as the Gītā refers to self-surrender being attained by one having knowledge after many births (Gītā VII. 19).

Our ancestors had a great *penchant* for classifications, divisions and sub-divisions. Bhakti is divided into *laukikī* (of the common people), *Vaidikī* (laid down by the Veda) and *ādhyātmikī* (philosophical), as in Padma V. 15. 164; or *mānasī* (mental), *vācikī* (verbal) and *kāyikī* (done with the body, such as fasts, vratas &c.) in Padma V. 15. 165–168; into Sāttvikī, Rājasī and Tāmasī (as in Bhāgavata III. 29. 7–10 and Padma VI. 126. 4–11); into best, middling and inferior as in Brahmāṇḍa III.[1555] 34. 38–41).

Prapatti (self-surrender) is distinguished from bhakti in works of the Rāmānuja and of other Vaiṣṇava schools. It consists of five points[1556] viz. resolution to yield (to God's will), the abandoning of opposition, faith that God will protect (the devotee), praying to God to save the devotee, and a feeling of helplessness shown by casting one's soul on Him. Bhakti has as synonyms the words' dhyāna', 'upāsanā' &c. and is subsidiary to *prapatti*. The Gītā explicitly makes no such distinction. In Gītā II. 7 Arjuna speaks of himself as 'prapanna' (who has approached or surrendered himself for salvation). The final advice at the end of the Gītā enjoins what is called *prapatti* in later works 'On me fix your mind, become my devotee, sacrifice

---

1554. अथातो भक्तिं व्याख्यास्यामः । सा त्वस्मिन्परप्रेमरूपा । अमृतस्वरूपा च । नारदभक्तिसूत्र 1–3.

1555. The ब्रह्माण्ड mentions नारद, शुक, अम्बरीष, रन्तिदेव, मारुति, बलि, बिभीषण, प्रह्लाद, गोपिs and उद्धव as exemplars of highest भक्ति; वसिष्ठ and मनु as practising मध्यमा and ordinary men as practising kaniṣṭhā (inferior) भक्ति. The नारदभक्तिसूत्र 83 mentions many of these as भक्त्याचार्याः : 'इत्येवं वदन्ति । जनजल्पनिर्भया एकमताः कुमारव्यासशुकशाण्डिल्यगर्गविष्णुकौण्डिन्य-शेष-उद्धव-आरुणिबलिहनुमद्विभीषणादयो भक्त्याचार्याः ।'. कुमार stands for नारद, son of ब्रह्मा.

1556. ध्यानशब्दवाच्या भक्तिर्विधामेवाङ्गतुविधा । '''प्रपत्तिर्नाम-आनुकूल्यस्य सङ्कल्पः प्रातिकूल्यस्य वर्जनम् । रक्षिष्यतीति विश्वासो गोप्तृत्ववरणं तथा । आत्मनिक्षेपकार्पण्यम्-इत्याद्यङ्गपञ्चकयुक्ता । यतीन्द्रमतदीपिका p. 64. This work remarks that this प्रपत्ति must be learnt from the lips of a guru and therefore it does not expound it. Some read आत्मनिक्षेपः कार्पण्यं and thus raise the aṅgas of प्रपत्ति to six.

to me, offer adoration to me; you will certainly reach me; I declare to you truly, you are dear to me. Giving up all (*dharmas*) duties, come to me as your (only) refuge; I shall release you from all sins; do not grieve'.[1557] Vide also Gītā VII. 14, 15 and XV. 4 for other instances of the use of the root 'pra-pad'. The theory propounded in the Gītā and other works on bhakti was that bhakti led on to 'prasāda' (favour or grace) of God which enables the devotee to attain mokṣa.[1558] The Gītā (18. 56, 58, 62) says 'a man, though always performing all actions, but solely depending on me, obtains an imperishable and eternal place through my favour; if you fix your mind on me, you will get over all difficulties through my favour; go to Him as the refuge with all your heart, O Arjuna, through His grace you will attain the highest peace and an everlasting abode.' In the Viṣṇupurāṇa Prahlāda[1559] is told by the Adorable One 'as your mind is firmly and devotedly fixed on me you will by my favour attain the highest bliss'. The idea of God's grace occurs both in the Kaṭha and Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣads:[1560] 'The Self, smaller than the small and greater than the great, is hidden in the heart of the creatures; a man who is free from willing anything and free from grief sees the greatness of the Self through the favour of the Creator'.

There is a great difference between the Gītā and the Nārāyaṇīya section. In the former, though the Supreme Soul is called Vāsudeva,[1561] the doctrine of the four vyūhas, that is very

---

1557. मन्मना भव मद्भक्तो मद्याजी मां नमस्कुरु । मामेवैष्यसि सत्यं ते प्रतिजाने प्रियोऽसि मे ॥ सर्वधर्मान् परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज । अहं त्वा सर्वपापेभ्यो मोक्षयिष्यामि मा शुचः ॥ गीता 18. 65-66. धर्मान् here refers to the duties of varṇas (brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya &c) and of āśramas (such as those of householder or ascetic &c.) or धर्मान् may refer to actions enjoined by the Veda and smṛtis. This last exhortation is practically repeated from the end of the 9th chapter 'मन्मना ...नमस्कुरु । मामेवैष्यसि युक्त्वैवमात्मानं मत्परायणः ॥' 9. 34.

1558. भक्तिप्रपत्तिभ्यां प्रसन्न ईश्वर एव मोक्षं ददाति । अतस्तयोरेव मोक्षोपायत्वम् । यतीन्द्रमतदीपिका p. 64.

1559. यथा ते निश्चलं चेतो मयि भक्तिसमन्वितम् । तथा त्वं मत्प्रसादेन निर्वाणं परमाप्स्यसि ॥ विष्णुपु० I. 20. 28.

1560. अणोरणीयान्महतो महीयानात्मास्य जन्तोर्निहितो गुहायाम् । तमक्रतुः पश्यति वीतशोको धातुः प्रसादान्महिमानमात्मनः । कठोप० II. 20, श्वेताश्व० III. 20 (reads आत्मा गुहायां निहितोस्य जन्तोः, अक्रतुम्, महिमानमीशम्).

1561. बहूनां जन्मनामन्ते ज्ञानवान्मां प्रपद्यते । वासुदेवः सर्वमिति स महात्मा सुदुर्लभः ॥ गीता VII. 19; वृष्णीनां वासुदेवोऽस्मि । गीता X. 37.

characteristic of the Nārāyaṇīya section, is totally absent and further even the names of Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha do not occur in the Gītā. In my opinion the Gītā is the older of the two, as it propounds the general doctrine of bhakti, while the Pāñcarātra doctrine in the Nārāyaṇīya is only one of the several bhakti schools. Moreover, the Nārāyaṇīya section represents that Gītā had already been proclaimed and that the knowledge brought from Śvetadvīpa by Nārada is the same as that declared in the Harigītā (chap. 346. 10–11, 348. 53–54). Śānti (348. 55–57) mentions that there was only one vyūha or there were two, three or four and that the Ekāntins attached great importance to ahiṁsā. Besides, the worship of Vāsudeva is older than Pāṇini, since[1562] Pāṇini teaches the formation of the word Vāsudevaka as meaning 'one whose object of worship is Vāsudeva'. Vide Dr. Bhandarkar's 'Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism &c.' paragraphs 2–10 (pp. 3–19 of vol. IV of the collected works) for the antiquity of Vāsudeva worship. The general view of most medieval writers on Dharmaśāstra about Pāñcarātra is represented by the Pārijāta quoted in the K. R. that the Pāñcarātra[1563] and Pāśupata śāstras are authoritative only so far as they are not opposed to the Vedas. This was the view of the Sūtasaṁhitā also, on which a commentary was composed by the famous Mādhavācārya.

In some Purāṇas the word Vāsudeva is not derived[1564] from Vasudeva (as the son of Vasudeva) but from the root 'vas' to dwell. 'Vāsudeva is so called because all beings dwell in the Highest Self and Vāsudeva dwells in beings as the soul of all'. Compare Gītā 9. 29 'I am alike to all beings; none is odious to me nor dear; but those who worship me with faith dwell in me and I too dwell in them'.

1562. भक्तिः। ...वासुदेवार्जुनाभ्यां वुन्। पा. IV. 3. 95 and 98 (वासुदेवः भक्तिः सेव्यः यस्य स वासुदेवकः).

1563. पञ्चरात्रपाशुपतादीन्यपि शास्त्राणि वेदाविरुद्धानि प्रमाणमेवेति पारिजातः। कृत्यरत्नाकर p. 37; तथा च योंशो मार्गाणां वेदेन न विरुध्यते। सोंशः प्रमाणमित्युक्तं केषांचिदधिकारिणाम्। अत्यन्तगलितानां तु प्राणिनां वेदमार्गतः। सूतसंहिता IV. 4, 16–18.

1564. सर्वाणि तत्र भूतानि वसन्ति परमात्मनि। भूतेषु च स सर्वात्मा वासुदेवस्ततः स्मृतः॥ विष्णुपु॰ VI. 5. 80, ब्रह्मपु॰ 233. 68 (reads निवसन्ति परात्मनि). There is another verse 'भूतेषु वसते योन्तर्वसन्त्यत्र च तानि यत्। धाता विधाता जगतां वासुदेवस्ततः प्रभुः॥ विष्णुपु॰ VI. 5. 82, ब्रह्मपु॰ 233. 70 (but it says that this verse contains what Prajāpati declared to great sages). विष्णुपु॰ (I. 2. 12–13) states 'सर्वत्रासौ समस्तं च वसत्यत्रेति वै यतः। ततः स वासुदेवेति विद्वद्भिः परिपठ्यते॥.'

The word *bhagavat* calls for a brief notice. It was generally applied to Vāsudeva. The Viṣṇupurāṇa says 'The word *bhaga* is applied to the six qualities collectively viz. fulness of sway, manliness (or energy), glory, auspiciousness, knowledge and indifference to wordly objects. This noble word *bhagavān* applies to Vāsudeva who is the Highest Brahma and to no one else'.[1565] The Viṣṇupurāṇa[1566] further states that the word 'bhagavat' may be applied secondarily to others on the ground of possessing special qualities "that person may be called 'bhagavān', who knows about the creation and dissolution (of the world), about the origin and final destiny of beings, and knows what is *vidyā* and *avidyā* (nescience). Knowledge, strength power, sway, manliness, splendour—all these in their entirety, excluding the three guṇas (and their effects) that are to be avoided, are expressed by the word bhagavat". Bhāgavata is one who worships 'Bhagavat' (i. e. Vāsudeva). This is an ancient word. It occurs in the Besnagar column inscription (of the 2nd century B C.) of Heliodora, a Greek of Takṣaśilā and ambassador of Antalikita, who calls himself a bhāgavata (a devotee of Vāsudeva); vide above p. 516 n. 742 and 'Indo-Greeks' by Prof. A. K. Narain (1957), where at end he gives the full Besnagara Ins. of nine lines and its reading (Plate VI.). It appears that 'bhagavat' was rarely applied to Śiva also. The Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad speaks[1567] of Śiva as 'bhagavān'. Patañjali in his bhāṣya on Pāṇini V. 2. 76 speaks of Śivabhāgavata.[1568] In the Ghosūṇḍī stone

---

1565. ऐश्वर्यस्य समग्रस्य वीर्यस्य यशसः श्रियः। ज्ञानवैराग्ययोश्चैव षण्णां भग इतीरणा॥ एवमेष महाञ्छब्दो मैत्रेय भगवानिति। परमब्रह्मभूतस्य वासुदेवस्य नान्यगः॥ विष्णुपु० VI. 5. 74 and 76. The वृद्धहारीतस्मृति VI. 164-165 has ऐश्वर्यं च तथा वीर्यं तेजः शक्तिरनुत्तमा। ज्ञानं बलं यदेतेषां षण्णां भग इतीरितः। एभिर्गुणैः संपूर्णो यः स एव भगवान् हरिः।, शङ्कराचार्य in भाष्य on ब्रह्मसूत्र II. 2. 44 remarks about the व्यूहs 'ईश्वरा एवैते सर्वे ज्ञानैश्वर्यशक्तिबलवीर्यतेजोभिरैश्वरैर्धर्मैरन्विता अभ्युपगम्यन्ते'. शङ्कराचार्य probably follows the विष्णुपुराण VI 5. 78-79.

1566. उत्पत्तिं प्रलयं चैव भूतानामागतिं गतिम्। वेत्ति विद्यामविद्यां च स वाच्यो भगवानिति॥ ज्ञानशक्तिबलैश्वर्यवीर्यतेजांस्यशेषतः। भगवच्छब्दवाच्यानि विना हेयैर्गुणादिभिः॥ विष्णुपु० VI. 5. 78-79; ब्रह्मपु० 233. 66-68.

1567. सर्वव्यापी स भगवान् तस्मात्सर्वगतः शिवः। श्वेताश्व० III. 11.

1568. अयःशूलदण्डाजिनाभ्यां ठक्ठञौ। पा. V. 2. 76; महाभाष्य 'किं योऽयःशूलेनान्विच्छति स आयःशूलिकः। किं चातः। शिवभागवते प्राप्नोति। एवं तर्ह्युत्तरपदलोपोऽत्र द्रष्टव्यः। अयःशूलमिवायःशूलम्। यो मृदुनोपायेनान्वेष्टव्यानर्थान् रभसेनान्विच्छति स उच्यते आयःशूलिकः।'. शिवभागवत is to be explained as शिवो भगवान् भक्तिरस्य शिवभागवतः i. e. a devotee that carried with him a trident, which is a weapon of Śiva.

Inscription[1569] in Sanskrit (near Nagarī in the Chitorgaḍh District of Rajputana) there is a reference to both Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva as *bhagavat* and it calls them Sarveśvara (about 200 B. C.), while the Besnagara inscription speaks of Vāsudeva alone and Heliodora calls himself bhāgavata. In some early records such as the Pīkira grant of Siṁhavarman (E. I. vol. VII. p. 161) and in Gupta Inscription No. 4 (at p. 27) Siṁhavarman and Candragupta (II) son of Samudragupta are called '*paramabhāgavata*'. Akrūra is styled mahābhāgavata in Brahmapurāṇa 190. 20; Padma VI. 280. 27 defines a Mahābhāgavata as noted below.[1570]

Three *mārgas* (paths) are spoken of in ancient works viz. karmamārga, bhaktimārga and jñānamārga. It is necessary to say here something about the path of *bhakti* and that of *jñāna*. Both these paths are deemed to lead to the same goal, viz. *mokṣa*. The mode of approach in the two is, however, different. In the path of knowledge (or *avyaktopāsanā*) it is not bare book knowledge of *brahman* as the Supreme Soul and as *nirguṇa* that will lead to mokṣa; for that purpose what is required is the *brāhmī-sthiti* (state of identifying oneself with *brahma*) mentioned in Gītā II. 72. This condition can be secured only by great efforts and long practice as described in Gītā II. 55 and the following verses. In the path of knowledge whatever actions the person concerned may do are *brahmārpaṇa*, as described in Gītā IV. 18–24. In the path of *bhakti* the bhakta resigns himself to God's grace and whatever he does he consigns to the God worshipped by him such as Vāsudeva (*saguṇa* and *vyakta*). Arjuna asks the Lord a question in Gītā XII. 1 'of the worshippers who thus constantly devoted meditate on you and those who (meditate) on the Unperceived and Indestructible, which

---

1569. Vide E. I. XVI pp. 25–27 and I A. vol. 61 pp. 203–205 for the Ghosūṇḍī Stone Inscription, where Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva are both styled 'Bhagavat' and 'Sarveśvara'.

1570. तापादिपञ्चसंस्कारी नवेज्याकर्मकारकः । अर्थपञ्चकविद् विप्रो महाभागवतः स्मृतः ॥ पद्म VI. 280. 27. For तापादि, vide note 1546 above. The nine modes of worship are स्मरणं &c. quoted in note 1571. The five heads under which the doctrines of the रामानुज school are discussed are: (1) जीव, (2) ईश्वर, (3) उपाय (way to God), (4) फल or पुरुषार्थ (the goals of human life), (5) विरोधिनः (obstructions or obstacles to the attainment of God). There is a work called अर्थपञ्चक by नारायण, in which each of the above five heads is shown to have five sub-divisions Vide Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar's paper in Proceedings of the International Congress of Orientalists held at Vienna in 1886, Aryan section, pp. 101–110 for a summary of the work called अर्थपञ्चक.

best know devotion'. The reply given in XII. 2–7 is 'those who, being constantly devoted and possessed of the highest devotion, worship me with a mind fixed on me are regarded by me as the most devoted. But those who, restraining the group of the senses, and with a mind equable to all, meditate on the indescribable, indestructible, unperceived (Principle), which is all-pervading, inconceivable, unconcerned, immoveable, and constant, they, devoted to the good of all beings, certainly attain to me. In the case of those whose minds are attached to the unperceived (Principle or Spirit) the trouble is much greater, since the unperceived goal is attained by embodied beings with difficulty. In the case of those, however, who dedicating all their actions to me and regarding me as their highest goal worship me, meditating on me with a devotion towards none beside me and whose minds are placed on me, I, without delay, become their deliverer from the ocean of *saṁsāra* and death'. In chapter 9 the path of bhakti is spoken of in these terms 'it is the chief among vidyās (lores), chief among mysteries; it is the best means of sanctification; it can be directly apprehended, it is in accordance with dharma, imperishable and *easy to practise*'. According to the Gītā, therefore, the path of bhakti is easier than the path of knowledge.

The Bhāgavata says that *bhakti* is ninefold[1571] viz. hearing about Viṣṇu, repeating his name, remembering him, worshipping the feet (of the image of Viṣṇu), offering pūjā, bowing (or homage), treating oneself as the slave of Viṣṇu, treating Him as a friend and surrendering one's soul to Him. According[1572] to Nārada-bhakti-sūtra it is elevenfold (as noted below). It is

---

1571. श्रवणं कीर्तनं विष्णोः स्मरणं पादसेवनम्। अर्चनं वन्दनं दास्यं सख्यमात्मनिवेदनम्॥ इति पुंसार्पिता विष्णौ भक्तिश्चेन्नवलक्षणा। क्रियते भगवत्यद्धा तन्मन्येऽधीतमुत्तमम्॥ भागवत VII. 5. 23–24. प्रह्लाद says this to his father. स्मृतिकीर्त्योः कथादेश्चार्तौ प्रायश्चित्तभावात्। शाण्डिल्य 74; स्मरणकीर्तनकथानमस्कारादीनामार्तभक्तौ निवेशः। स्वमेव महापातकिनां त्वार्तौ। शाण्डिल्य 82; पतनहेतुपापरतानां च पुनरार्तिभक्तावेवाधिकारः प्रायश्चित्तवत् तत्पापक्षयस्य सर्वापेक्षयाभ्यर्हितत्वात्। ...तदुपगमे तु सुतरामधिकारसिद्धिः।. The भक्तिप्रकाश (part of वीरमित्रोदय) in pp. 30–128 explains these nine at great length. Even the तान्त्रिक writers took over these nine modes of bhakti e. g. the रुद्रयामल (27. 103–104) provides 'मननं कीर्तनं ध्यानं स्मरणं पादसेवनम्। अर्चनं... निवेदनम्॥ एतद्भक्तिप्रसादेन जीवन्मुक्तस्तु साधकः।'.

1572. गुणमाहात्म्यासक्ति-रूपासक्ति-पूजासक्ति-स्मरणासक्ति-दास्यासक्ति-सख्यासक्ति-वात्सल्यासक्ति-कान्तासक्ति-आत्मनिवेदनासक्ति-तन्मयतासक्ति-परमविरहासक्तिरूपा एकधा अपि एकादशधा भवति। नारदभक्तिसूत्र 83. The वृद्धहारीतस्मृति 81–83 gives slightly differing nine aspects of bhakti.

not to be supposed that all these nine methods have to be practised at the same time. A devotee practising any one of these, viz. remembering or reciting His name, may thereby become a true bhakta, and may win God's favour and secure liberation (Śāṇḍilyasūtra 73). The Gītā (VII. 16-17) states 'four classes of men, who are (all) fortunate, worship me viz. one who is in distress, the seeker after knowledge, one who seeks some desired object (or seeks wealth), one who is possessed of knowledge; of these he who is possessed of knowledge, who is always devoted and who worships One (Being) only is distinguished (above others), for to the man of knowledge I am extremely dear and he is dear to me'. Śāṇḍilya provides that the four aspects (out of nine) viz. remembering God, reciting His name, narrating stories about Him and bowing to Him (His image), find their place in the bhakti of those who are distressed, for these are said to be the means of expiation of sins, as the Viṣṇupurāṇa says (II. 6. 39) that remembering Kṛṣṇa is superior to all prāyaścittas. Śāṇḍilya further says that those guilty of mortal (grave) sins are only entitled to the bhakti of the distressed; but when their sins have been wiped off they would be entitled to the other forms of bhakti.

Gītā does not expressly enumerate all these nine modes of bhakti, but most of them can be gathered from various passages of the Gītā such as IX. 14, 26, 27 and from passages in other Purāṇas. For example, the Viṣṇupurāṇa[1573] says 'whatever be the expiatory rites, consisting of austerities, deeds of charity &c., to remember Kṛṣṇa is superior to them all' and 'that repetition of His name with bhakti is the best solvent of all sins, as fire is of metals'. In the Bhāgavata[1574] it is said 'whatever the devotee does by his body, speech, mind, organs of sense, by his intellect or by his soul or by the force of temperament that he follows— all that he should offer to Nārāyaṇa who is highest'. This is entirely in line with Gītā IX. 27 and may be called 'dāsya-bhakti'; while Arjuna's bhakti is '*sakhya-bhakti*', as Lord Kṛṣṇa himself speaks of him as 'my devotee and a friend' (Gītā

1573. प्रायश्चित्तान्यशेषाणि तपःकर्मात्मकानि वै । यानि तेषामशेषाणां कृष्णानुस्मरणं परम्॥ विष्णुपु० II. 6. 39 = पद्म VI. 72. 13; यन्नामकीर्तनं भक्त्या विलायनमनुत्तमम् । मैत्रेयाशेषपापानां धातूनामिव पावकः॥ विष्णुपु० q. by स्वप्नेश्वर on शाण्डिल्यभक्तिसूत्र 74.

1574. कायेन वाचा मनसेन्द्रियैर्वा बुद्ध्यात्मना वानुसृतस्वभावात् । करोति यद्यत्सकलं परस्मै नारायणायेति समर्पयेत्तत्॥ भाग. XI. 2 36.

IV. 3). It appears that the Gītā regards the performance[1575] of the duties of his station in life by a *bhakta* as worship (*arcana* or *pūjā*) of God 'worshipping by the performance of one's duties (without an eye to the fruit or rewards of them) God from whom the world springs and by whom all this world is permeated, a man obtains perfection (and not only by offering flowers or by reciting the name of God).

This central doctrine of the Gītā of what is called 'niṣkāma-karma' was accepted by the Purāṇas. The Viṣṇu II. 3.25 adopts it. The Agnipurāṇa in chapter 381 gives a summary of the Gītā in 58 verses which are mostly made up of passages from the Gītā. It winds up the summary with the verse quoted in note 1575 and emphasizes bhakti in the last verse.[1576] The Garuḍa-purāṇa summarises the Gītā in 28 verses (I. 237–238). The Padma (in VI. 171–188) contains the *māhātmya* of each of the 18 chapters of the Gītā interspersed with legends about the fruit of reading each Gītā chapter (1005 verses in all). A few further examples may be cited. The Kūrma says[1577] 'therefore even a man not possessed of (high) wisdom should perform all his duties (or actions) abandoning with all efforts the fruit (or reward) of actions; he obtains (high) abode after some time'; 'actions done after offering them to me do not tend to bind down the doer but tend to *mukti* (liberation)'. The Mārkaṇḍeya also refers to 'niskāma-karma'. The Bhāgavata-purāṇa provides 'a man performing (the rites) prescribed by the Veda but without attachment (not caring for the reward) and surrendering them to God secures freedom from the bondage of *karma* and the declaration of the reward (in the Veda) is only meant for stimulating effort.'

The doctrine of *advaita* in the Upaniṣads (such as in Īśā 16, Tai. Up. III. 4 and 8, Bṛ. Up. II. 4. 14, IV. 3. 30–31, IV. 5. 15) was for the wise. They offer very little to the ordinary man

---

1575. यतः प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानां येन सर्वमिदं ततम्। स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः॥ गीता 18. 46.

1576. अतः प्रवृत्ति'''भ्यर्च्य विष्णुं सिद्धिं च विन्दति। कर्मणा मनसा वाचा सर्वावस्थासु सर्वदा। ब्रह्मादिस्तम्बपर्यन्तं जगद्विष्णुं च वेत्ति यः। सिद्धिमाप्नोति भगवद्भक्तो भागवतो ध्रुवम्॥ अग्निपु॰ 381. 56–58. कर्माण्यसङ्कल्पिततत्फलानि संन्यस्य विष्णौ परमात्मभूते। अवाप्य तां कर्ममहीमनन्ते तस्मिँल्लयं ये त्वमला प्रयान्ति। विष्णुपु॰ II. 3. 25.

1577. तस्मात्सर्वप्रयत्नेन त्यक्त्वा कर्माश्रितं फलम्। अविद्वानपि कुर्वीत कर्माप्नोति चिरात्पदम्॥ कूर्म I. 3. 21; 'मय्यर्पितानि कर्माणि न बन्धाय विमुक्तये।' कूर्म II. 7. 28; न च बन्धाय तत्कर्म भवत्यनभिसन्धितम्। मार्क॰ 92. 15; वेदोक्तमेव कुर्वाणो निःसङ्गोऽर्पितमीश्वरे। नैष्कर्म्यां लभते सिद्धिं रोचनार्था फलश्रुतिः॥ भागवत XI. 3. 46.

about God or the ultimate destiny of man or the way to God and did not solve the common man's problems. The Gītā took up the problems of the common man; it shows to the lowliest of the lowly that there is hope for him, that the One and the True Being can enter into his life, if he consecrates all the daily duties and actions of his station in life to God and that salvation will come to every one if one has loving faith in God and surrenders himself entirely to his Grace. The Gītā proclaims (IX. 30-32) 'If even a man that has been very badly conducted worships me without worshipping any one else he should be regarded as a good man, since he has resolved upon the right course; he quickly becomes a righteous soul and reaches everlasting peace: O Arjuna! you may affirm that my devotee is never ruined. By taking refuge with me even those that are born in despised castes, also women, vaiśyas and śūdras reach the highest goal'. The Śāṇḍilya-bhakti-sūtra provides[1578] that all down to persons of the despised castes are entitled (to follow the path of bhakti) as they are capable of learning bhakti at second hand just as they can learn the common rules (of ahiṁsā, truthfulness &c.). The Purāṇas speak in the same strain as the Gītā and are sometimes even more explicit and emphatic. The Brahma-purāṇa paraphrases Gītā IX. 32 and proceeds 'my devotee even if he be a *cāṇḍāla* attains the desired beatitude, if he be endowed with the right faith; what need be said about others?' The Padma[1579] states 'A Pulkasa or even a śvāpaka and other persons belonging to Mleccha tribes become eminent and worthy of being honoured, if they are solely devoted to the worship of the feet of Hari'; 'Even a śvapāka is a Vaiṣṇava if on his lips there is the name of Hari, in whose heart there is Viṣṇu and in whose stomach goes food offered to Viṣṇu'. The Bhāgavata contains[1580]

1578. आनिन्द्ययोन्यधिक्रियते पारम्पर्यात् सामान्यवत्। शाण्डिल्यसूत्र 78.

1579. पुल्कसः श्वपचो वापि ये चान्ये म्लेच्छजातयः। तेऽपि वन्द्या महाभागा हरिपादैकसेवकाः॥ पद्म I. 5. 10. येषां मुखे हरेर्नाम हृदि विष्णुः सनातनः। उदरे विष्णुनैवेद्यं स श्वपाकोऽपि वैष्णवः॥ पद्म IV. 10. 66.

1580. किरातहूणान्ध्रपुलिन्दपुल्कसा आभीरकङ्का यवनाः खसादयः। येऽन्ये च पापा यदुपाश्रयाश्रयाः शुध्यन्ति तस्मै प्रभविष्णवे नमः॥ भागवत II. 4. 18; विश्वामित्र pronounced a curse on his 50 elder sons, who did not consent to accepting Śunaḥśepa adopted as a son by Viśvāmitra as their eldest brother, that their progeny would be Andhras, be reduced to the status of the lowest class and they would be Śabaras &c. and mostly *dasyus* as follows: 'तानन्वव्याजहारान्तान्वः प्रजा भक्षीष्टेति। त एतेऽन्ध्राः पुण्ड्राः शबराः पुलिन्दा मूतिबा इत्युदन्त्या बहवो भवन्ति वैश्वामित्रा दस्यूनां भूयिष्ठाः। ऐ. ब्रा. VII. 18 (chap. 33. 6). In E. I. VIII p. 88 there is an Inscription of the 9th year of king Īśvarasena, an Ābhīra, son of Śivadatta, an ābhīra, in the Nasik caves (No. 15 plate VII).

the following remarkable statement: 'Homage to that Supreme Lord, by resorting to whom as refuge Kirātas[1581] (mountain-dwellers like Bhils), the Hūṇas, Andhras, Pulindas, Pulkasas, Ābhīras, Kaṅkas, Yavanas, Khasas and the like and other degraded men are purified.' These sentiments were not mere platitudes, but had been very largely acted upon. Even in the medieval ages in India we have women saints like Mirābai and Āṇḍāḷ (in South India), untouchables as saints like Nanda, Cokhāmeḷā (in Mahārāṣṭra), Rai Das (a *chāmār* disciple of Rāmānanda), sinners like Ajāmila honoured as saints. Saints like Kabir[1582] (a Moslem weaver) and Tukārām had probably not much book learning, but their hymns are recited by Hindus including orthodox brāhmaṇas.

The invasions and gradual conquest of India by Moslem invaders from the Northwest threw down a challenge to Hindus from 11th century A.D. onwards. It was met in various ways. The first was the composition of comprehensive digests of smṛtis of which the earliest extant one is the Kṛtyakalpataru of *Lakṣmīdhara* (about 1110–1130 A.D.) in the North and Hemādri in the Deccan (third quarter of 13th century). The second and the most important way was on the spiritual front. From the 13th to the 17th century there was a great revival of spirituality on an unprecedented scale which produced saints and mystics in all parts of India such as Jñāneśvara, Nāmadeva, Rāmānanda, Kabir,[1582] Caitanya,

1581. Pulkasas and Śvapākas were degraded and untouchable castes. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II pp. 88-89 for Pulkasa and p. 97 for Śvapāka (lit. who subsists on dog-meat). Pulkasa occurs in Vāj. S. 30. 17. Kirātas are assigned to caves in Vāj. S. 30. 16. The Ābhīras are described as dasyus and mlecchas in Mausala-parva 7. 46–63, they are said to have attacked Arjuna in Pañcanada when he was taking women with him after Kṛṣṇa's passing away and to have carried away Vṛṣṇi women (Mausala 8. 16–17). Vide also the same account in Viṣṇupurāṇa V. 38. 12–28. Matsya 273. 18 speaks of ten Ābhīra kings. The Khasa tribe had the custom of a brother marrying his deceased brother's widow. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 861 n. 1671.

1582. Vide G. H. Westcott on 'Kabir and Kabir-panth' (Cawnpore, 1907) and 'Kabir and his followers' by F. E. Keay (1931). Kabir's teaching was an amalgam of both Hindu and Moslem ideas. He preached a doctrine of theism that did not tolerate polytheism, incarnations and idols. Kabir is said to have been a disciple of Rāmānanda (who lived about 1400–1470 A. D.), an ascetic who preached at Benares that God should be worshiped under the name of Rāma. Kabir held to the doctrines of Karma and Transmigration. He believed in the unity of God, but makes use of many names such as Rāma, Khudā, Allāh, Śakti in speaking of Him.

Dadu (in Rajasthan), Nānak, Vallabhācārya, Ekanātha, Tukārām, Rāmadāsa (and many others of lesser fame) who all agreed on fundamentals viz. unity of God, the need of self-purification, condemnation of the pride of caste and of formalities of worship, and surrender to the Deity for salvation. The third was the creation of such independent kingdoms as that of Vijayanagara (1330–1565 A. D.), of Mahārāṣṭra (under Shivaji and the Peshwas) and of the Sikhs in Punjab. This last cannot be dealt with way in this work. The doctrine of bhakti had a great appeal to all sections of the Hindu community and its propagation by the Purāṇas went a long away in weaning away Hindus from Buddhism. Not only so, Mahāyāna Buddhism took over the doctrine of bhakti and works like the 'Questions of Milinda' and the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka[1583] contain passages which agree closely with the Gītā. The Gītā exhibits a wonderful spirit of tolerance and accommodation, not found in the scriptures of other religions which were founded by great prophets. It says[1584] 'even those, who are devotees of other deities and worship them with faith, (indirectly) worship me only but with a non-śāstric (or irregular) procedure.' The Bhāgavata-purāṇa elaborates the same idea; 'O Adorable One! others worship you alone in the form of Śiva while following the path promulgated by Śiva and propounded in different ways by several *ācāryas*, all worship you who are Lord and who comprehend in yourself all gods; those also who are devotees of other deities and appear to have different ideas do in the end reach you, just as all rivers rising in mountains and flooded by rains enter the ocean from all sides'. The Śāntiparva[1585] also contains a similar idea 'Those who worship Brahmā, Śiva or other deities and whose conduct (or practice) is intelligent will (ultimately) come to me, who am the Highest'. This doctrine has its germs in the Ṛgveda[1586]

1583. Vide H. Kern's Introduction to the translation of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka in SBE, vol. 21, pp. XXVI–XXVIII and XXIX n. 2, XXXI n. 1, XXXI n. 2.

1584. येऽप्यन्यदेवताभक्ता यजन्ते श्रद्धयान्विताः। तेऽपि मामेव कौन्तेय यजन्त्यविधिपूर्वकम्॥ गीता IX. 23; त्वामेवान्ये शिवोक्तेन मार्गेण शिवरूपिणम्। बह्वाचार्यविभेदेन भगवन्समुपासते॥ सर्वं एव यजन्ति त्वां सर्वदेवमयेश्वरम्। येऽप्यन्यदेवताभक्ता यद्यप्यन्यधियः प्रभो॥ यथाद्रिप्रभवा नद्यः पर्जन्यापूरिताः प्रभो। विशन्ति सर्वतः सिन्धुं तद्वत्त्वां गतयोऽन्ततः॥ भागवत X. 40. 8–10.

1585. ब्रह्माणं शितिकण्ठं च याश्चान्या देवताः स्मृताः। प्रबुद्धचर्याः सेवन्तो मामेवैष्यन्ति यत्परम्॥ शान्ति 341, 36.

1586. एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्त्यग्निं यमं मातरिश्वानमाहुः॥ ऋ. I. 164. 46.

itself where it is said 'the One Reality the sages speak of under various names; they call it Agni, Yama, Mātariśvan (wind-god)'. This work cannot afford, for reasons of space, to go into the several bhakti schools such as those of Rāmānuja, Madhva (who postulated five eternal *bhedas*), Caitanya and Vallabha (that gave rise to an erotico-mystical brand of bhakti) and others.

In their zeal for the spread of the cult of bhakti the Purāṇas are sometimes guilty of gross exaggeration. The Brahmapurāṇa[1587] says 'men even after having committed many sins under the influence of error (or delusion), do not go to Hell, if they worship Hari who removes all sins; those men also who always remember Janārdana, though they may be guilty of roguery, reach, after they die, the happy world of Viṣṇu. Even a man who is habituated to flying into extreme rage, if he recites the name of Hari, has his faults destroyed and attains *mukti* (liberation) as the king of Cedi country did'. The Vāmanapurāṇa[1588] observes "what has that person got to do with many *mantras* (i. e. he has no use for those), who is a bhakta of Viṣṇu? The mantra 'namo Nārāyaṇāya' is able to accomplish all objects. Success is for those who have bhakti for Viṣṇu; how can there be failure for them in whose heart is enthroned Janārdana dark like a blue lotus?" The Vāmana and Padma Purāṇas say that a man secures the same results by repeating the names of Viṣṇu that he would secure by visiting all the tīrthas (sacred places) and holy shrines[1589] in the world.

Many Purāṇas, particularly the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata, are replete with the eulogies, the theory and practice of *bhakti*

1587. कृत्वापि बहुशः पापं नरा मोहसमन्विताः । न यान्ति नरकं नत्वा सर्वपापहरं हरिम् ॥ शाठ्येनापि नरा नित्यं ये स्मरन्ति जनार्दनम् । तेपि यान्ति तनुं त्यक्त्वा विष्णुलोकमनामयम् ॥ अत्यन्तक्रोधसक्तोऽपि कदाचित्कीर्तयेद्धरिम् । सोपि दोषक्षयान्मुक्तिं लभेच्चेदिपतिर्यथा ॥ ब्रह्म 216. 87–89. चेदिपति appears to refer to शिशुपाल, whose story occurs in सभापर्व chapters 43–45. He was the sister's son of Kṛṣṇa who had promised to forgive 100 *aparādhas* of his and at last killed him at the Rājasūya sacrifice of Yudhiṣṭhira. The story of शिशुपाल also occurs in विष्णुपु० IV. 15. 1–17 and it is said that शिशुपाल always took the name of Kṛṣṇa and always thought of him though as an enemy, and therefore he ultimately reached the Lord 'अयं हि भगवान् कीर्तितश्च संस्मृतश्च द्वेषानुबन्धेनापि अखिलसुरासुरादिदुर्लभं फलं प्रयच्छति किमुत सम्यग्भक्तिमतामपीति ।' 17.

1588. किं तस्य बहुभिर्मन्त्रैर्भक्तिर्यस्य जनार्दने । नमो नारायणायेति मन्त्रः सर्वार्थसाधकः ॥ विष्णुर्येषां जयस्तेषां कुतस्तेषां पराजयः । येषामिन्दीवरश्यामो हृदयस्थो जनार्दनः ॥ वामन 94. 58–59. For the first verse, vide also नरसिंहपु० 63. 6.

1589. पृथिव्यां यानि तीर्थानि पुण्यान्यायतनानि च । तानि सर्वाण्यवाप्नोति विष्णोर्नामानुकीर्तनात् ॥ वामन 94. 63, पद्म VI. 245. 85.

and illustrative stories about it. For reasons of space it is not possible to go into this matter at any length. A few noteworthy points alone will be touched. A few verses eulogising the Bhāgavatapurāṇa may be cited as samples of extreme exaggeration. 'Thousands[1590] of Aśvamedhas and hundreds of Vājapeya sacrifices are not equal to even the 16th part of the story narrated by Śuka; he who always recites a half or a quarter verse of the Bhāgavata secures the merit of Rājasūya and Aśvamedha; he who listens to the words of the śāstra of Śuka (i.e. Bhāgavata) at the time of death, Govinda being pleased with him confers on him Vaikuṇṭha; this is a good expiation for all sinners viz. uttering the name of Viṣṇu, since (at that time) their mind has Viṣṇu as the only object of thought'.[1591] Another point is the story of Ajāmila in the Bhāgavata (VI. 1. 20 ff and VI. 2), Padma (I. 31. 109 and VI. 87. 7) and other Purāṇas. Ajāmila[1592] (who abandoned his brāhmaṇa wife and kept a mistress) was a moral wreck addicted to gambling and thieving. When on his deathbed at the age of 80 he loudly called upon his youngest son named Nārāyaṇa (out of ten sons born of the mistress) with affection and recited that name and thought of that alone, he became free from his sins and attained a high position difficult to attain'. Such stories have given rise to the common belief that the last thought at one's death leads to a new birth appropriate to that thought (*ante matiḥ sā gatiḥ*). The Upaniṣads contain the germ of the idea of the last thought; vide. Chān. Up. III. 14. 1, VIII. 2. 10, Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 5. In the 'Questions of Milinda' (SBE vol. 35 pp. 123–124) this idea of the importance of the last thought is taken up. It may be that a single heart-felt invocation of the name of God, a single act of faith after

---

1590. अश्वमेधसहस्राणि वाजपेयशतानि च। शुकशास्त्रकथायाश्च कलां नार्हन्ति षोडशीम्॥ श्लोकार्धं श्लोकपादं वा पठेद्भागवतं च यः। नित्यं पुण्यमवाप्नोति राजसूयाश्वमेधयोः॥ अन्तकाले तु येनैव श्रूयते शुकशास्त्रवाक्। प्रीत्या तस्यैव वैकुण्ठं गोविन्दोपि प्रयच्छति॥ पद्म VI. 191. 32, 39, 41.

1591. The Padmapurāṇa (VI. 189–194, 518 verses) contains a lengthy eulogy of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa and of listening to its recitation for seven days (*saptāha*) &c.

1592. कान्यकुब्जे द्विजः कश्चिद् दासीपतिरजामिलः। नाम्ना नष्टसदाचारो दास्याः संसर्गदूषितः॥ बन्द्यक्षकैतवैश्चौर्यैर्गर्हितां वृत्तिमाश्रितः। भागवत VI. 1. 21–22; म्रियमाणो हरेर्नाम गृणन् पुत्रोपचारितम्। अजामिलोप्यगाद्धाम किं पुनः श्रद्धया गृणन्॥ भागवत VI. 2. 49; सर्वेषामप्यघवतामिदमेव सुनिष्कृतम्। नामव्याहरणं विष्णोर्यतस्तद्विषया मतिः॥ भागवत VI. 2. 10; म्रियमाणः सुतस्नेहात्प्रोच्य नारायणेति च। तद्ध्याननामग्रहणात्पदं लेभे सुदुर्लभम्॥ पद्म IV. 87. 7; विक्रुश्य पुत्रमघवान्यदजामिलोपि नारायणेति म्रियमाण इयाय मुक्तिम्॥ पद्म I. 31. 109.

repentance and complete surrender to God's will, cancels the result of a whole life of crime and sin. This is the moral of Ajāmila's story, but it is liable to be grossly misapprehended and might create a complacent belief that a man may commit as many sins in his life as possible, but if he remembers God at his death and repeats His name then, all sins of his are cleared away and wiped out. This is a rather dangerous doctrine. The Gītā (VIII. 5-7) puts the matter in a clear light. 'That person, who remembers me at the time of death and passes from the world leaving the body, attains my essence, there is no doubt about that. Whatever form a man remembers when he leaves the body, to that he goes, *because he was always engrossed in that form.* Therefore remember me at all times and engage in battle; there is no doubt that having fixed your mind and intellect on me you will attain to me'. This passage of the Gītā suggests that a person will remember the name of God at the time of his death only if he had been so doing all his life, while engaged in actively performing all his duties and not caring for the rewards thereof and that it is extremely rare or almost impossible for a man to remember God at the last moment when throughout his life he had been ungodly and a great sinner. The above idea is again emphasized in verses 10-13 of chap. VIII (of the Gītā) and in chap. XIII. 3 (yo yac-chraddhaḥ sa eva saḥ).

In spite of the doctrine that God is one[1593] and the doctrine that whatever form of the deity one may worship, the worship reaches the Supreme Being, Vaiṣṇavas and Śaivas have been wrangling and abusing one another. For example, the Varāha-

---

1593. The proposition that God is only one, that He is worshipped under various perceptible forms for concentrating the mind on Him, worship or contemplation of a formless object being difficult, are doctrines taught in the Purāṇas in spite of the fact that they preach worship of Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa, Śiva, Devī and others. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II pp. 714-715 and pp. 118-119 above. The विष्णुधर्मोत्तर I. 65. 32 states: साकारे बद्धलक्षस्तु शून्यं शक्नोति चिन्तितुम्। अन्यथा तु सुकष्टं स्यान्निरालम्बस्य चिन्तनम्॥; vide also विष्णुधर्मोत्तर III. 108. 23 ff, particularly the verse आदौ कृत्वा महाभागे साकारे लक्षबन्धनम्। ततः समर्थो भवति शून्ये ध्याने नरोत्तम॥ 26. Indian theologians and philosophers deliberately spared lower forms of worship with the thought that it was better to begin at a lower rung of the ladder to the highest goal than not to have a footing at all. A well-known verse is: अग्नौ क्रियावतां देवो दिवि देवो मनीषिणाम्। प्रतिमास्वल्पबुद्धीनां योगिनां हृदये हरिः॥ नृसिंहपुराण 62. 5 q. by अपरार्क on p. 140.

purāṇa makes Rudra declare the supremacy of Viṣṇu (chap.[1594] 70. 14 Nārāyāṇaḥ paro devaḥ), denounce Śaiva-siddhāntas that are outside the pale of the Vedas and put forward the outstanding view 'that such non-Vedic views were promulgated by Śiva himself at the request of Viṣṇu in order to delude people'. Some Purāṇas started by saying that the Bauddhas and Jainas[1595] were asuras and enemies of gods that were purposely deluded by god. For example, the Matsya (24. 43–49) says that the sons of Raji deprived Indra of his kingdom and share in sacrifices, that Bṛhaspati, at Indra's request, deluded the sons of Raji by composing a treatise of Jina-dharma which was opposed to the Veda and then Indra killed them. Vāyu 96. 230–32, Matsya 47. 11–12, Bhāgavata I. 3. 24 appear to suggest that Viṣṇu himself deluded the people. The Agni (16. 1–4) also says with reference to the Bauddhas that Viṣṇu deluded them. The Viṣṇu-purāṇa[1596] (III. 17–18) narrates that when the gods were

---

1594. त्वं च रुद्र महाबाहो मोहशास्त्राणि कारय । अल्पायासं दर्शयित्वा मोहयाशु महेश्वर: (र?) ॥ वराह 70. 36; this verse and several more are quoted from वराह by अपरार्क p. 1052; ये वेदमार्गनिर्मुक्तास्तेषां मोहार्थमेव च । नयसिद्धान्तसंज्ञाभिर्मया शास्त्रं तु दर्शितम् ॥ वराह 70. 41; त्वं हि रुद्र महाबाहो मोहनार्थं सुरद्विषाम् । पाखण्डाचरणं धर्मं कुरुष्व च महामते ॥ तामसानि पुराणानि कथयात्र च तान् प्रति । मोहनानि च शास्त्राणि कुरुष्व च महामते ॥ पद्म VI. 263. 24–25; तथा पाशुपतं शास्त्रं त्वमेव कुरु सुव्रत । कङ्कालशैवपाषण्ड-महाशैवादिभेदतः । अवलक्ष्य मतं सम्यग्वेदबाह्यं द्विजाधमाः । भस्मास्थिधारिणः सर्वे भविष्यन्ति न संशयः ॥ पद्म VI. 263. 32–33. कङ्कालशैवs are the कापालिकs. Compare similar passages in Kūrma I. 12. 261-62; Devībhāgavata VII. 39. 26–31 (अन्यानि यानि शास्त्राणि लोकेऽस्मिन् विविधानि च ॥ श्रुतिस्मृतिविरुद्धानि तामसान्येव सर्वशः । वामकापालकं चैव कौलकं भैरवागमः ॥ शिवेन मोहनार्थाय प्रणीतो नान्यहेतुकः । ...शैवाश्च वैष्णवाश्चैव सौराः शाक्तास्तथैव च । गाणपत्या आगमाश्च प्रणीता शङ्करेण तु ॥ तत्र वेदाविरुद्धांशोऽप्युक्त एव क्वचित् क्वचित् । वैदिकैस्तद्ग्रहे दोषो न भवत्येव कर्हिचित् ॥).

1595. दिग्वाससामयं धर्मो धर्मोऽयं बहुवाससाम् । इत्यनेकान्तवादं च मायामोहेन नैकधा ॥ तेन दर्शयता दैत्याः स्वधर्मं त्याजिता द्विज ॥ विष्णुपु० III. 18. 11–12. This is an obvious reference to the Jain doctrine of सप्तभङ्गीनय.

1596. स्वल्पेनैव हि कालेन मायामोहेन तेऽसुराः । मोहितास्तत्यजुः सर्वां त्रयीमार्गाश्रितां कथाम् ॥ केचिद्विनिन्दां वेदानां देवानामपरे द्विज । यज्ञकर्मकलापस्य तथान्ये च द्विजन्मनाम् ॥ नैतद्युक्तिसहं वाक्यं हिंसा धर्माय चेष्यते । हवींष्यनलदग्धानि फलायेत्यर्भकोदितम् । यज्ञैरनेकैर्देवत्वमवाप्येन्द्रेण भुज्यते । शम्यादि यदि चेत्काष्ठं तद्वरं पत्रभुक् पशुः । निहतस्य पशोर्यज्ञे स्वर्गप्राप्तिर्यदीष्यते । स्वपिता यजमानेन किन्नु तस्मान्न हन्यते । तृप्तये जायते पुंसो भुक्तमन्येन चेत्ततः । कुर्याच्छ्राद्धं श्रमायान्नं न वहेयुः प्रवासिनः ॥ विष्णुपु० III. 18. 24–29. Vide a similar narrative about Māyāmoha or Mahāmoha and his being naked, shaved, carrying peacock feathers &c. in पद्म V. 3. 346–390 (this last refers to 24 तीर्थंकरs). In the सर्वदर्शनसंग्रह (ed. by M. M. Vasudevashastri Abhyankar, 1924) under चार्वाकदर्शन certain verses are quoted from बृहस्पति which closely resemble the above, e. g. पशुश्चेन्निहतः स्वर्गं ज्योतिष्टोमे गमिष्यति । स्वपिता यजमानेन तत्र कस्मान्न हिंस्यते ॥ p. 13. Vide पद्म V. 13. 370–374 for almost the same verses as in विष्णुपुराण.

defeated by the asuras (who also practised tapas and studied the Veda) they approached Viṣṇu and prayed to him to help them and to destroy the asuras and that then Viṣṇu produced from his body Māyā-moha (lit. who causes delusion by wiles) and made him over to the gods. Māyāmoha, who was naked, had shaved his head and held a bunch of peacock feathers in his hand, went to the asuras that were practising tapas on the banks of the Narmadā (III. 18. 1-2) and told them that if they followed his words they would secure *mukti*, led them away from the path of the Veda, taught them formulas of sceptical reasoning and weaned them away from their dharma. Then he approached other asuras and taught them that sacrificing animals was sinful, taught them nirvāṇa and the doctrines of *vijñānavāda*. Some of the passages are very striking 'In a short time the asuras were deluded by Māyāmoha and abandoned all concern with the path depending on the three Vedas. Some condemned the Vedas, some condemned the gods, while others condemned the body of sacrificial rites and brāhmaṇas. (They thought or said) The statement that killing an animal (in sacrifices) is desirable for the sake of Dharma (for accumulating merit) does not stand to reason; to say that offerings burnt by fire would conduce to reward (in the next world) is childish talk; (if it be said that) Indra attained the position of God by means of many sacrifices and enjoys the fuel-sticks of the śamī tree, then an animal (that subsists on leaves) is superior to Indra (who enjoys hard and thorny śamī *samidhs*). If it is desired (by the Veda) that the animal killed in a sacrifice attains heaven, then why does not the sacrificer kill his own father in a sacrifice (and send him to heaven)? If one (the son) performs śrāddha (with the thought) that what is eaten by one (brāhmaṇa diner at śrāddha) tends to give satisfaction to another (i. e. the deceased father of the offerer of śrāddha), then travellers would not carry food (on their backs) which causes weariness to them.' These are the arguments used by atheists (cārvākas). It is remarkable that even *tāntrik* works like the Kulārṇavatantra make Śiva say that he declared certain śāstras purely for deluding certain bad people who did not know the Kaula dharma.[1597]

From condemning the Jainas and Bauddhas some Purāṇas, entirely unmindful of what the Gītā declared (in note 1584),

1597. भ्रामिता हि मया देवि पशवः शास्त्रकोटिषु । कुलधर्मं न जानन्ति वृथा शास्त्राभिमानिनः ॥ पशुशास्त्राणि सर्वाणि मयैव कथितानि हि । मूर्त्यन्तरं तु गत्वैव मोहनाय दुरात्मनाम् ॥ कुलार्णवतन्त्र II. 96–97 (ed. by Arthur Avalon).

proceeded so far as to say[1598] that a brāhmaṇa who is not a Vaiṣṇava is a heretic, that Viṣṇu himself assuming the form of Buddha proclaimed a false śāstra, and that all śāstras such as the Pāśupata, Vaiśeṣika of Kaṇāda, Nyāya of Gautama, Sāṅkhya of Kapila, Cārvāka of Bṛhaspati are *tāmasa*; that the *māyāvāda* (of Śaṅkara) is a false śāstra and is disguised Bauddha (doctrine) and the extensive śāstra (Pūrvamīmāṁsā) of Jaimini is condemned, since it made gods as of no use (in his system). The words of the Padma-purāṇa are; 'Listen O Goddess, while I declare to you in order the *tāmasa* śāstras, by merely remembering which even wise men become sinners. First of all I promulgated Śaiva śāstras such as the Pāśupata system; then the following were declared by brāhmaṇas that were possessed (or engrossed) by my *śakti* (power); viz. Kaṇāda proclaimed the great Vaiśeṣika system, the Nyāya and Sāṅkhya systems were declared respectively by Gautama and Kapila: the much despised Cārvāka doctrine was declared by Bṛhaspati, while Viṣṇu, assuming the form of Buddha, promulgated, for bringing about the destruction of *daityas*, the false doctrine of Bauddhas that go about naked or dressed in blue garments; I myself, O goddess, assuming the form of a brāhmaṇa declared in the Kali age the false śāstras of the doctrine of Māyā which is *bauddha* in disguise. The brāhmaṇa Jaimini composed the great system of Pūrvamīmāṁsa, which is unmeaning on account of its atheistic discourse'. Vijñāna-bhikṣu in his Sāṅkhya-pravacanabhāṣya (who flourished about 1550 A. D.) quotes eleven verses from the Padma VI. 263 and holds the peculiar view that no śāstra that is *āstika* (admits a soul) is unauthoritative nor is there any contradiction, each śāstra being of full force and true in its own sphere. The original Sāṅkhya sūtra, on which he comments, tries to establish the impossible thesis that the teachings of the Sāṅkhya are not in real or irreconcilable contradiction with the doctrine of all-pervading oneness of *brahma* or with the doctrine that *brahma* is bliss (*ānanda*) or the system of theism (i. e. a personal God). Sectarian exclusiveness and bigotry went so far that the Brahmāṇḍa[1599] contains a dialogue between sage Agastya and

1598. अवैष्णवस्तु यो विप्रः स पाषण्डः प्रकीर्तितः। पद्म VI. 262. 27. The वृद्धहारीतस्मृति also requires the zealous Vaiṣṇava not to pay homage to or worship another god nor to enter the temple of another god 'नान्यं देवं नमस्कुर्यान्नान्यं देवं प्रपूजयेत्। नान्यप्रसादं भुञ्जीत नान्यदायतनं विशेत्॥ 8. 85-86.

1599. शृणु देवि प्रवक्ष्यामि तामसानि यथाक्रमम्। येषां स्मरणमात्रेण पातित्यं ज्ञानिनामपि॥ प्रथमं हि मया चोक्तं शैवं पाशुपतादिकम्। मच्छक्त्यावेशितैर्विप्रैः प्रोक्तानि च ततः शृणु॥

(*Continued on next page*)

Rāma in which it is said that the 108 names of Kṛṣṇa (who is acknowledged by all to be an incarnation of Viṣṇu) are so potent that the merit secured by repeating thrice the 1008 names of Viṣṇu is secured by repeating only once one of the 108 names (of Kṛṣṇa).[1600]

The Viṣṇu and Padma do not stand alone in this strange story of Viṣṇu himself or through Rudra teaching false doctrines for deluding the ungodly or those that dissented from or reviled the Vedas. There were other Purāṇas that sing the same tune; for example, the Kūrma-purāṇa indulges in a *vendetta* against many śāstras and systems in several places. A few passages are set out here. (Devī says) ' the various[1601] śāstras that are found in this world and are opposed to the Vedas and smṛtis are based on *tamas* (ignorance), viz. Kāpāla, Bhairava, Yāmala (a class of Tantra works), Vāma (left-hand practices of a class of Tantras), Ārhata (Jain doctrines), these and others are meant for deluding (persons); I produced these śāstras in another birth for deluding people ' ; ' therefore in order to protect (people) against those who were beyond the pale of the Vedas and for the destruction of sinners we shall, O Śiva, compose śāstras for deluding them; Rudra being thus advised by Mādhava (Viṣṇu) composed śāstras that delude and Viṣṇu also urged on by Rudra did the same;

(*Continued from last page*)

कणादेन तु संप्रोक्तं शास्त्रं वैशेषिकं महत्। गौतमेन तथा न्यायं सांख्यं तु कपिलेन वै ॥ धिषणेन तथा प्रोक्तं चार्वाकमतिगर्हितम्। दैत्यानां नाशनार्थाय विष्णुना बुद्धरूपिणा। बौद्धशास्त्रमसत्प्रोक्तं नग्ननीलपटादिकम्। मायावादमसच्छास्त्रं प्रच्छन्नं बौद्धमुच्यते। मयैव कथितं देवि कलौ ब्राह्मणरूपिणा। ... द्विजन्मना जैमिनिना पूर्वं वेदमपार्थकम्। निरीश्वरेण वादेन कृतं शास्त्रं महत्तरम् ॥ पद्म VI. 263. 67–71 and 75–76, quoted by विज्ञानभिक्षु in सांख्यप्रवचनभाष्य pp. 6–7 (B. I. edition).

1600. शृणु देवि प्रवक्ष्यामि नाम्नामष्टोत्तरं शतम्। सहस्रनाम्नां पुण्यानां त्रिरावृत्त्या तु यत्फलम्। एकावृत्त्या तु कृष्णस्य नामैकं तत्प्रयच्छति। तस्मात्पुण्यतरं चैतत् स्तोत्रं पातकनाशनम् ॥ ब्रह्माण्ड III. 36. 18–20. Verses 21–41 set out the 108 names of Kṛṣṇa. The one thousand and eight names of Viṣṇu are set out in Mahābhārata, Anuśāsanaparva 149. 14–120 and the Garuḍa-purāṇa (I. 15. 1–160) contains names of विष्णु, but often different from those in अनुशासन.

1601. यानि शास्त्राणि दृश्यन्ते लोकेऽस्मिन्विविधानि तु। श्रुतिस्मृतिविरुद्धानि निष्ठा तेषां हि तामसी ॥ कापालं भैरवं चैव यामलं वाममार्हतम्। एवंविधानि चान्यानि मोहनार्थानि तानि तु ॥ मया सृष्टानि शास्त्राणि मोहायैषां भवान्तरे ॥ कूर्म I. 12. 261–263; vide also कूर्म I. 16 17–19 and 24–26 where कापाल, नाकुल, वाम, भैरव, पञ्चरात्र and पाशुपत are mentioned as produced for the same purpose. The ताराभक्तिसुधार्णव (6th तरङ्ग) p. 272 quotes the कूर्मपुराण passage and remarks that those passages are meant only for praising the Veda and are not to be understood as conveying that *Tāntrik āgamas* are unauthoritative.

(they produced the śāstras) called Kāpāla, Nākula,[1602] Vāma, Bhairava (early and later), Pāñcarātra, Pāśupata and thousands of others; Śaṅkara came down to the earth, wearing garlands of skull-bones and covered with ashes from a cemetery and wearing profuse matted pair, trying to delude this world and engaged in begging for the benefit of these'; 'One should[1603] not honour even by words *Pañcarātra* and *Pāśupata* people that are heretics, following prohibited avocations and those who follow left-hand *śākta* practices; when Buddhist mendicants, Nirgranthas, those who study the Pañcarātra doctrines, Kāpālikas, Pāśupatas and other similar heretics, being bad and deluded, eat the śrāddha food (meant for a deceased person) that śrāddha would be of no use in this world and the next.' For details of some of the heretical sects, vide 'Heretical sects in the Purāṇas' by Śrī Radhakrishna Choudhary in ABORI vol 37 (1956) pp. 234-257.

The Gītā (in chapter 16) speaks of two classes of people, viz. those born to godlike endowments and those born with demoniac qualities and describes the latter in verses 7-20. Some of the verses probably indicate that the reference is to atheists and the like; for verse 8 states 'they say that the world is devoid of truth

---

1602. Nākula stands for what is Lakulīśa-pāśupata-darśana in the Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha. The Liṅgapurāṇa (24. 124-133) dilates upon Lakulī. The Vāyupurāṇa (chap. 23. 221-224) mentions in a prophetic vein Nakulī (Lakulī) as the founder of a Śaiva sect and Kāyārohaṇa (modern Karavan in Dabhoi Taluka of former Baroda State) as its sacred place (siddha-kṣetra). The Mathurā Ins. of Candragupta II dated in Gupta era 61 (380 A. D.) in E. I. vol. XXI pp. 1 ff shows that Lakulī, the founder of the Pāśupata sect, flourished about the first century A. D. Vide Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar's 'Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism' &c. p 166 (in collected works) and the paper 'Antiquities in Kārvan with reference to Lakulīśa worship' in Journal of Bom. Uni. vol. 18 part 4 pp. 43-67 by Mr. M. R. Majmudar and Pāśupata-sūtra of Nakulīśa in T. S. S.; E. I. vol. XXI pp. 1-9, JBBRAS vol. XXII pp. 151-167 (both by D. R. Bhandarkar), IHQ. vol. 19 (1943) pp. 270-271 for the origin and history of the Lakulīśa sect.

1603. पाखण्डिनो विकर्मस्थान्वामाचारांस्तथैव च। पञ्चरात्रान् पाशुपतान् वाङ्मात्रेणापि नार्चयेत्॥ कूर्म II. 16. 15; वृद्धश्रावकनिर्ग्रन्थाः पञ्चरात्रविदो जनाः। कापालिकाः पाशुपताः पाषण्डा ये च तद्विधाः॥ यस्याश्नन्ति हवींष्येते दुरात्मानस्तु तामसाः। न तस्य तद्भवेच्छ्राद्धं प्रेत्य चेह फलप्रदम्॥ कूर्म II. 21. 32-33. The verse बौद्धश्रावक ...तद्विधाः is q. by हे. on श्राद्ध p. 365 from कूर्मपुराण and on p. 476 हे. quotes both the verses from कूर्म and reads वृद्धश्रावक°. The निर्ग्रन्थs were naked Jaina monks (vide SBE. vol. 21 p. 263 and E. I. vol. 20 p. 59) where a Jain teacher is called Nigrantha Śramaṇācārya in Gupta year 159 i.e. (478-79 A. D). The words are : 'पञ्चस्तूप-निकायिक-निग्रन्थ-श्रमणाचार्य-गुहनन्दिशिष्यप्रशिष्याधिष्ठितविहारे.'

(i. e. contains nothing that one can believe), devoid of any fixed principle (such as virtue and vice), devoid of a Ruler, and is produced by union brought about by lust and nothing else'. After describing their thoughts and aspirations the Gītā winds up 'these perform sacrifices which are so in name only with hypocrisy and against the prescribed procedure; they hate me in their own bodies and in those of others; these impure and cruel enemies I continually throw down in demoniac wombs; coming into demoniac wombs and being deluded, in each birth they go to vilest states without ever coming to me'. This is entirely different from what the Padma and other Purāṇas say about Pāśupatas, Pāñcarātras and about non-Vaiṣṇavas.

Both the Bhāgavata and the Padma say that[1604] (the cult of) bhakti first arose in Draviḍa country, it progressed or prospered in the Karṇāṭaka, it was found in only a few places in Mahārāṣṭra and declined in the Gurjara country; it was, on account of the terrible Kaliyuga, broken up by heresies and remained weak for a long time; but having reached Vṛndāvana (near Mathurā) it got a fresh start and assumed fine form. In book XI. the Bhāgavata again reverts to this assertion that in Kali people are solely devoted to Nārāyaṇa only in a few places but to the greatest extent in the Draviḍa country where flow the rivers Tāmraparṇī, Kṛtamālā, Kāverī and Mahānadī flowing to the west and states that those who drink the waters of these rivers are generally devotees of Vāsudeva.

Most great moral and spiritual upheavals have a tendency to reach a very low level in course of time. That appears to have happened in the case of bhāgavatas. The Atri-smṛti has a verse containing a sarcastic reference to bhāgavatas[1605]: 'Those who are devoid of Vedic studies learn śāstras (such as grammar, vedānta, logic &c.), those who are wanting in śāstric lore become readers of Purāṇas for others; those who cannot be readers of Purāṇas become tillers; but those who are broken down even

---

1604. उत्पन्ना द्राविडे साहं वृद्धिं कर्णाटके गता। क्वचित् क्वचिन्महाराष्ट्रे गुर्जरे जीर्णतां गता ॥ तत्र घोरकलेर्योगात् पाखण्डैः खण्डिताङ्गका। दुर्बलाहं चिरं जाता पुत्राभ्यां सह मन्दताम् ॥ वृन्दावनं पुनः प्राप्य नवीनेव सुरूपिणी। भागवत I. 1. 48–50, पद्म VI. 189. 54–56. The पद्म VI. 189 speaks of the भागवत as the highest among Purāṇas: 'कलौ खलु भविष्यन्ति नारायणपरायणाः ॥ क्वचित् क्वचिन्महाराज द्राविडेषु च भूरिशः। ताम्रपर्णी नदी यत्र कृतमाला पयस्विनी। कावेरी च महापुण्या प्रतीची च महानदी। ये पिबन्ति जलं तासां मनुजा मनुजेश्वर। प्रायो भक्ता भगवति वासुदेवेऽमलाशयाः ॥ भागवत XI 5. 38–40

1605. वेदैर्विहीनाश्च पठन्ति शास्त्रं शास्त्रेण हीनाश्च पुराणपाठाः। पुराणहीनाः कृषिणो भवन्ति भ्रष्टास्ततो भागवता भवन्ति ॥ अत्रिसंहिता verse 384.

there, become bhāgavatas'. Atri appears to say that bhāgavatas are idlers, who do not study Veda or śāstra or who cannot even read Purāṇas to others for their livelihood or do not engage in agriculture and who pretend to be worshippers (or *bhaktas*) of Viṣṇu or Kṛṣṇa and fatten on what is given by others that are deluded into thinking that they have forsaken everything for the sake of their love of God. They become what are called 'buwās' in Marāṭhi and other modern Indian languages.

Another striking development of the bhakti cult is the Erotic Mysticism (*madhurā bhakti*) associated with the worship of Kṛṣṇa and of Rādhā in that form of Vaiṣṇavism established by Caitanya and Vallabhācārya. For the Vaiṣṇava movement inspired by Caitanya, vide Dr. S. K. De's work on 'the Vaiṣṇava faith and movement in Bengal' (Calcutta 1942) and the author's 'History of Sanskrit Poetics' (1951) about Ujjvala-nīlamaṇi of Rūpa-gosvāmin pp. 298-302. In the bhakti cult established by Vallabhācārya great importance is attached to the *guru*, who is one of the descendants of Vallabhācārya and to whom almost divine honours are paid. A wonderful development of bhakti towards Rāma, regarded in the Rāmāyaṇa and in popular tradition as a paragon of restraint and all manly virtues, culminated in an erotic mysticism about Rāma and Sītā also. The devotees of this mystic cult have to consider themselves as brides of Rāma or the female friends of Sītā, they are supposed to seek Lord Rāma's favour through Sītā, who graciously intercedes with the Lord for the devotees. Among the followers of Vallabhācārya the guru tells the devotee to look upon him (the guru) as Kṛṣṇa and upon himself or herself as Rādhikā.

For want of space further details about these bhakti cults have to be passed over.

Supreme importance is attached to Vedic mantras and also Paurāṇika mantras. They will have to be dealt with at some length in the sections on Tantras and on Pūrvamīmāṅsā. But some treatment of mantras, particularly vedic, may be given here as well. The word *mantra* occurs about twenty-five times in the Ṛgveda. Only *once* does the word *mantrakṛt* occur in the Ṛgveda[1606] (IX. 114. 2) 'O sage Kaśyapa! offer obeisance

---

1606. ऋषे मन्त्रकृतां स्तोमैः कश्यपोद्वर्धयन् गिरः। सोमं नमस्य राजानं यो जज्ञे वीरुधां पतिरिन्द्रायेन्दो परिस्रव। ऋ. IX. 114. 2; हस्ते दधानो नृम्णा विश्वान्यमे देवान्धाद्गुहा निषीदन्। विदन्तीमत्र नरो धियंधा हृदा यत्तष्टान् मन्त्राँ अशंसन्॥ ऋ. I. 67. 2; सायण

(*Continued on next page*)

to king Soma Lord of plants with the chants of the composers (or authors) of mantras, thereby sending forth your own voice &c.' Mr. Kapali Sastry is inaccurate when he states (on p. 67 of the translation of his 'Ṛgbhāṣya-bhūmikā in English) 'we see *frequent* mention made in the Rik Saṁhitā of the rishi as the author of the mantra' and he cites only Ṛg. IX. 114. 2 and I. 67. 2. The latter contains no word like mantrakṛt. Ṛg. I. 67. 2 (addressed to Agni) runs 'holding in his hand all powers (or riches), sitting in a cave (i. e. concealed) he placed the gods in fright; heroes (men or gods) that place (offer) prayers know him (Agni) to be here when they recite mantras formed in the heart.' There is no direct reference to ṛṣis here (but to naraḥ) and what is emphasized is that mantras already extant as the heart's outpourings enable the reciters of the mantras to find him (Agni). There is nothing to show that the mantras referred to in the verse are meant to be *impromptu*; the idea is rather that mantras that already existed and conveyed heartfelt devotion have to be employed to find Agni. The very next verse makes the position clear when it says, 'like the unborn (Sun) he (Agni) supports the wide earth and fixes in its place the sky on account of the mantras that turn out true'. This clarifies two things, viz. that when this mantra (I. 67. 3) was recited there already existed a host of mantras[1607] and secondly, that the mantras that existed long before were deemed to have helped in supporting the earth and the sky. The ancient mantras were supposed to bring Indra to attend thrice in the day for a short time to the sacrifices of devotees when invoked with mantras addressed to him (Ṛg. III. 53. 8); similarly, mantras when recited by wise men bring Yama to receive offerings (Ṛg. X. 14. 4); Ṛg. X. 88. 14 states 'we raise our voices with mantras towards Vaiśvānara Agni, who is wise and who shines brilliantly all days'. The word mantra[1608] is

---

(Continued from last page)

explains 'अग्नौ हविर्भिः सह पलायिते सति सर्वे देवा अभैषुरित्यर्थः।'; अजो न क्षां दाधार पृथिवीं तस्तम्भ द्यां मन्त्रेभिः सत्यैः। ऋ. I. 67. 3.

1607. रूपं रूपं मघवा बोभवीति मायाः कृण्वानस्तन्वं परि स्वाम्। त्रिर्यद्दिवः परि मुहूर्तमागात् स्वैर्मन्त्रैरनृतुपा ऋतावा॥ ऋ. III. 53. 8; आ त्वा मन्त्राः कविशस्ता वहन्त्वेना राजन् हविषा मादयस्व। ऋ. X. 14. 4; वैश्वानरं विश्वहा दीदिवांसं मन्त्रैरग्निं कविमच्छा वदामः॥ ऋ. X. 88. 14.

1608. प्र नूनं ब्रह्मणस्पतिर्मन्त्रं वदत्युक्थ्यम्। यस्मिन्निन्द्रो वरुणो मित्रो अर्यमा देवा ओकांसि चक्रिरे॥ तमिद्वोचेमा विदथेषु शम्भुवं मन्त्रं देवा अनेहसम्। ऋ. I. 40. 5-6; मन्त्रमखर्वं सुधितं सुपेशसं दधात यज्ञियेष्वा। पूर्वीश्चन प्रसितयस्तरन्ति तं य इन्द्रे कर्मणा भुवत्॥ ऋ. VII. 32. 13; समानं मन्त्रमभि मन्त्रये वः समानेन वो हविषा जुहोमि॥ ऋ. X. 191. 3.

also employed in the singular several times. A few striking passages are set out here. 'Indeed, God Brahmaṇaspati (Lord of Prayer) proclaims the mantra fit for recitation (by the mouth of the hotṛ), in which the gods Indra, Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman make their abode, O Gods!'; 'We utter that very mantra (in which Indra and other gods are praised together) in our sacrifices, the mantra being one that produces bliss and being free from all blemishes (or is incomparable); 'Do place among the Gods a mantra that is not short, that is well-arranged and that is well ornamented; ancient fetters do not reach him who is in (the good grace of) Indra by the sacrifice (or praise); 'I address the same mantra for you (all) and offer for you (all) one offering (into fire)'. From these passages it appears that when these verses were recited there was a body of already existing mantras; which were supposed to be inspired by the Lord of prayers (or speech) and from which the choice of a long and well-formed one was to be made. Apart from the above passages the word mantra occurs in Ṛg. I. 31. 13, I. 74 1, I. 147, 4, I. 152. 2, II. 35. 2, VI. 50. 14, VII. 7. 6, X. 50. 4 and 6, X. 106. 11, in only one of which (Ṛg. II. 35. 2), apart from Ṛg. I. 67. 2 already quoted, the words 'hṛdā ā sutaṣṭam mantram' (mantra well chiselled from the heart) are used and in another verse more simply the word 'atakṣan' (in VII. 7. 6 *mantram* ye vāram naryā *atakṣan*) alone is used. In two passages (Ṛg. X. 95.1 and X. 191. 3 first half) the word 'mantra' appears to mean 'consultations, holding counsel together'. In Ṛg. I. 20. 4, Ṛbhus are called 'satyamantrāḥ' and are said to have made their parents young. There are controversies about what the Ṛbhus stand for and it is difficult to say what is meant by 'satyamantrāḥ' in relation to Ṛbhus. Ṛg. VII. 76. 4. is a[1609] somewhat enigmatic verse. It means 'they (Aṅgirases) alone, (our) ancient pitṛs, learned (or wise) and following the right path, enjoyed companionship among gods and they found out the Light (the Sun) concealed (by Svarbhānu, eclipse); they, whose mantras were true, brought forth Uṣas.' In some passages where other words like *stoma* or *brahma* are used, there is

1609. त इद्देवानां सधमाद आसन्नृतावानः कवयः पूर्व्यासः। गूळ्हं ज्योतिः पितरोऽन्वविन्दन्सत्यमन्त्रा अजनयन्नुषासम्॥ ऋ. VII. 76. 4. Aṅgirases are spoken of as Pitṛs in Ṛg. X. 14. 6 (अङ्गिरसो नः पितरो नवग्वाः) and in Ṛg. V. 40. 9 Atris are said to have found out the Sun afflicted with darkness by Svarbhānu, an Āsura and no one else was able to do so (यं वै सूर्यं स्वर्भानुस्तमसाविध्यदासुरः। अत्रयस्तमन्वविन्दन् नह्यन्ये अशक्नुवन्॥). This last is a reference to a total eclipse of the Sun, on the occurrence of which the Atris probably assured frightened people that the sun would shine forth in a short time.

mention of the stoma or brahma being made and polished by the devotee (e. g. X. 39. 14 'etam vām stomam-Aśvināvakarmātakṣāma bhṛgavo na ratham'). Vide Ṛg. I. 62. 13 for 'navyam atakṣad brahma', Ṛg. V. 29.15 (Indra brahma kriyamāṇā juṣasva śaviṣṭha yā te navyā akarma); brahmakṛtaḥ (composers of prayers or praises) are mentioned in Ṛg. VII. 32. 2 and X. 50. 7. Other words like *gir* (several hundred times), dhīti (about 100 times), brahma (over a hundred times) mati (about 100 times), manīṣā (over 60 times), vacas and vacasyā (over 100 times), stoma (about 200 times), sukīrti (five times), sūkta (four times) are employed in the sense of 'thought, word or thought-out hymn or verse of praise' and in several cases the sages of the Ṛgveda state that it is a new verse or hymn of praise that they employ. Vide 'navyasībhir-gīrbhiḥ' and 'giram bhare navyasīm jāyamānām' in Ṛg. V. 42. 13., in Ṛg. VI. 49. 1, VII. 53. 2; 'Pra tavyasīm *navyasīm dhītimagnaye*' in Ṛg. I. 143. 1; 'vaiśvānarāya *matir-navyasī* śuciḥ soma iva pavate' (Ṛg. VI. 8. 1) and 'iyam te *navyasī matir* agne adhāyyasmadā' (Ṛg. VIII. 74. 7); iyam te agne navyasī manīṣā' Ṛg. X. 4. 6; 'tā valgū[1610] Dasrā puruśākatamā *pratnā navyasā vacasā* vivāse' (Ṛg. VI. 62. 5); 'navyasī sukīrtiḥ' in Ṛg. I. 60. 3; 'sa pratnavat *navyase* viśvavāra *sūktāya* pathaḥ kṛṇuhi' in Ṛg. IX. 91. 5; 'nū *navyase navīyase sūktāya* sādhayā pathaḥ' in Rg. IX. 9. 8. It is a remarkable fact that when words like 'sukīrtiḥ' and 'sūkta' that occur only four or five times in the whole of the Ṛgveda are qualified by the word 'new or fresh', the word 'mantra' occurring so many times does not even once bear the adjective 'new'. This emphasizes the conclusion stated above that in the times of many of the extant Ṛgvedic verses mantras were a large group already existing, from which prayers were drawn as occasion required, though now and then new verses were added to those already existing. It may here be stated that in some places the Ṛgveda looks upon prayers (*dhīti*) as divine and as on the same level with Aśvins, Uṣas, and the Sun (VIII. 35. 2) and that ancient prayers were inherited from ancestors (III. 39. 2 'seyamasme sanajā pitryā dhīḥ').

Several hymns and verses of the Ṛgveda are purely philosophical, cosmological, mystic and speculative as I. 164. 4, 6, 29,

1610. Here the contrast is great. The Aśvins are *pratnā* (ancient) but the ṛṣi (in VI. 62. 5) says that he worships the ancient Dasras (Aśvins) with a *new prayer*. This ṛṣi at least does not convey that the Aśvins were seen by him.

32, 39, 42; X. 71, X. 90 (Puruṣasūkta), X. 121 (Hiraṇyagarbha), X. 129, X. 81-82 (Viśvakarman), X. 72, X. 125 (Vāk), X. 154 (state after death), X. 190 (creation).

About the meaning and purpose of Vedic mantras there are great controversies. This much may be said here that according to the Pūrvamīmāṁsā system the whole Veda is concerned with sacrifices, that Veda is divided into two classes, Mantra and Brāhmaṇa, that Vidhis (hortatory passages) are the most important part of the Veda, that a very large number of Vedic passages are mere arthavādas (that contain either praises of vidhis or are to be explained metaphorically or merely repeat what already exists or are of a legendary character) and that mantras only serve the purpose of bringing to the mind of the sacrificer or priests what is to be done in a sacrifice and that the words used in the mantras ordinarily bear the same meaning as that in popular Sanskrit.

Long before Yāska (several centuries before Christ) there were several schools of Vedic interpretation such as the Aitihāsikas (who acc. to Nir. II. 16 said that Vṛtra was an Asura son of Tvaṣṭṛ, while acc. to the Nairuktas Vṛtra means only 'cloud' and the Veda contains metaphorical descriptions of battles, that the twins that Saraṇyu is said in Ṛg. X. 17. 2 to have given up are according to the Nairuktas Indra and the Mādhyamikā-vāk, while according to the Aitihāsikas they are Yama and Yamī, as stated in Nir. XII. 10), the school of Naidānas is mentioned about 'syāla' and 'sāma' in Nir. VI 19, the school of ancient yājñikas in Nir. V. 11. Ṛg. I. 164. 32 (ya īm cakāra) is differently explained by the Parivrājakas (ascetic school) and the Nairuktas (etymologists). The Nirukta also mentions the names of seventeen individual predecessors (from whom it differs often and who differ among themselves) such as Āgrāyaṇa, Audumbarāyaṇa, Kautsa, Gārgya, Gālava, Śākaṭāyana, Śākapūṇi. There are several mantras of which two different meanings are given in the Nirukta as in Nir. V. 11 on Ṛg. VIII. 77. 4. In Ṛg. I. 164 there are several verses with two meanings or more e. g. verse 21 (yatrā suparṇā &c.) has two meanings (acc. to Nir. III. 13) one relating to the devatā Sūrya (*adhidaivata*) and the other spiritual (adhyātma); similarly, verse 32 of the same hymn has two meanings in the Nirukta (II. 8); the verse 39 (ṛco akṣare parame vyoman) is explained in four ways by Sāyaṇa; verse 41 (gaurīr-mimāya) is explained by Sāyaṇa in two ways, both being different from Yāska's explanation (in Nir.

XI. 40); verse 45 (catvāri vāk parimitā padāni) is explained in six ways (more or less different from each other) by Sāyaṇa; it is also explained in the Mahābhāṣya (p. 7 of M. M. Abhyankara-śāstri's ed.). The verse 'catvāri śṛṅgā' (Ṛg. IV. 58. 3) has been the subject of varying explanations from very early times. Nir. (XIII. 7) explains it as referring to Yajña. The Mahābhāṣya (p. 6 of the Mahābhāṣya *ibid.*) also does the same. Sāyaṇa explains it as referring to Agni (identified with yajña) and Sūrya. This verse is a riddle. Śabara[1611] in his bhāṣya on P. M. S. I. 2. 38. ('abhidhāne arthavādaḥ') explains it but Kumārila differs from him. Sāyaṇa and others explain it (e. g. the word 'tridhā') with reference to Mantra, Brāhmaṇa and Kalpa, but when this verse was first proclaimed there must bave been no Brāhmaṇas and Kalpasūtras. In several cases the Nirukta gives the adhidaivata (physical) and adhyātma (metaphysical or spiritual) or adhiyajña and adhyātma as in Nir. X. 26 (on Ṛg. X. 82. 2 'Viśvakarmā vimanā), Nir. XI. 4 (on Ṛg. X. 85. 3, adhiyajña and adhidaivata meanings), Nir. XII. 37 (on Vāj. S. 34. 55 'sapta ṛṣayaḥ', both adhidaivata and adhyātma), Nir. XII. 38 (on Atharva X. 8. 9 'Tiryag-bilaś-camasa &c.' both adhidaivata and adhyātma). In Ṛg. (I. 164) verses 11–13 and 48 contain a very imaginative and poetic description of the year, the seasons, months and total days and nights.

In recent years Śrī Aurobindo in 'Hymns to the mystic Fire' (translated in the esoteric sense, 1946) and his ardent and devout disciple Sri. T. V. Kapali Sastry (in 'Ṛgbhāṣya-bhūmikā in Sanskrit and its English translation, Pondicherry 1952) have started a theory about the Ṛgveda mantras which must be briefly stated and examined. Śrī Aurobindo first intended to publish an edition of the Ṛgveda with a word by word construction and an English translation. But he gave up that idea on account of other pre-occupations and rests content in the above book with the text and translation of about 230 verses in all from the 1st, 2nd and 6th *maṇḍalas* of the Ṛgveda and a foreword of 48 pages in which he propounds his theory. While

---

1611. शबर (on पू. मी. सू. I. 2, 38) explains : 'चत्वारो होत्राः शृङ्गाणीवास्य । त्रयोऽस्य पादा इति सवनाभिप्रायम् । द्वे शीर्षे इति पत्नीयजमानौ । सप्तहस्तास इति च्छन्दांस्यभिप्रेत्य । त्रिधा बद्ध इति त्रिभिर्वेदैर्बद्धः । '. The तन्त्रवार्तिक on this says 'चत्वारि शृङ्गेति रूपकद्वारेण यागस्तुतिः कर्मकाले उत्साहं करोति । '"चत्वारि शृङ्गा इति दिवसयामानां ग्रहणम् । त्रयोऽस्य पादा इति शीतोष्णवर्षाकालाः । द्वे शीर्षे इत्ययनाभिप्रायम् । सप्तहस्ता इत्यश्वस्तुतिः । त्रिधा बद्ध इति सवनाभिप्रायेण ।.' It would be noticed that the तन्त्रवार्तिक differs from शबर on almost every clause.

this was being written by the present writer, Śrī Aurobindo's large work of 634 pages 'on the Veda' published in 1956 reached his hands. Over 60 hymns are dealt with in this big book and 283 pages are devoted to the elaboration of his theory first outlined in the brief work of Śrī Aurobindo mentioned above and reiterated with greater emphasis. On page 9 of the work of 1956 he states "the ritual system recognized by Sāyaṇa may stand, the naturalistic sense discovered by European scholarship may, in its general conceptions be accepted, *but behind there is always the true and still hidden secret of the veda* – the secret words which were spoken for the purified in soul and the awakened in knowledge'. In this work also he sticks to the meaning of ṛta as truth and on p. 84 translates 'ṛtam' as 'Truth-consciousness', when in his first work he translated 'ṛta-cit' as Truth-consciousness'. Instead of comparing the several hundred passages where the word ṛta occurs in the Ṛgveda he sticks to his own rendering which is unacceptable to most scholars and makes a very perfunctory attempt at finding the correct meaning. One should like to have some clear examples of the distinction between Light and Consciousness in modern times and also in the Veda. So far as the present writer knows, in the language of ancient symbolism Consciousness is identified with Light. In the recently published book he deals with less than $\frac{1}{15}$th of the total hymns (1017 or 1028) of the Ṛgveda. Readers are asked to subscribe to his views although he condescends to translate in the first work less than $\frac{1}{20}$th of the total number of verses in the Ṛgveda and hardly ever enters into a discussion about the meaning of words like ṛta. Śrī Aurobindo (Foreword p. III) concedes that Sāyaṇa does not reject the spiritual authority of the Veda and that Sāyaṇa does not deny that there is a higher truth contained in the *ṛks*. He further says (IX) that we must take seriously the hint of Yāska (Śrī Aurobindo does not quote the Nirukta, but probably he has in mind Nir. I. 20 'sākṣātkṛtadharmāṇa ṛṣayo babhūvuḥ'). Then he proceeds to state (XVII) that many whole hymns of the Veda bear on their face a mystic meaning and that the ṛṣis (p. XIX) for the sake of secrecy resorted to double meanings, a device easily manageable in the Sanskrit language. This is a hypothesis which cannot at all be accepted and is no more than mere conjecture. The Vedic mantras were composed thousands of years ago, when all persons among whom the sages moved must have spoken the same language, though generally not so polished and poetical as that of the mantras and they were not addressed to men like the moderns whose

every day thoughts, surroundings and languages are entirely different. Both the Master and the disciple (Mr. Kapali Sastry) cause confusion (or, may be, are themselves confused) by supposing that the difficulties of the modern students of mantras did exist even at or near the time of the mantras. The most sublime thought of the Ṛgveda is that there is only one Spirit behind the various gods, Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Agni, Yama, Mātariśvan, that originally there was only that One, there was no day and night, no death and immortality. Śrī Aurobindo himself describes (p. XXXII) Ṛg. I. 164. 46 and X. 129. 2 as 'the summit of the vedic teaching.' This view of the one Entity is also illustrated in Ṛg. VIII. 58. 2 'one and the same Agni is kindled in many places, the one Sun enters the whole world and becomes many; the one Dawn illumines all this (physical) world, One became all this (assumes various forms)'. No secrecy was observed about this fundamental truth and it was proclaimed in mantras that can be understood even by an ordinary man of to-day who knows a little Sanskrit. Because we of these recent centuries cannot understand some mantras, that does not mean that the ancient seers were guilty of a subterfuge and purposely composed mantras with two meanings. They might have indulged in the pastime of two meanings (express and metaphorical) in a few cases as poetic devices.[1612] It is no fault of the sages, if we cannot understand their meaning, just as a blind man, who does not see a wooden post and comes to grief by dashing against it, should not blame the post, but should blame himself; we are to blame ourselves and should not foist upon the ancient sages a stratagem created by our own imagination or lack of knowledge (Nir. I. 16).[1613]

1612. The Master (Śrī Aurobindo) and the pupil are at variance about the poetic character of the Mantras. Śrī Aurobindo (p. XXXIV) after saying that his translation is a literary and not a strictly literal one speaks of the hymns as '*great poetry*', magnificent in their colouring and images, noble and beautiful in rhythm. Now let us hear the disciple. On p. 65 Mr. Kapali Sastry states 'the hymnal poetry is unusual, different from other poetry, even from the most superb specimen' and then he chides the readers and men like the present author and impliedly his own Master 'it is not permissible (why?) to class Vedic hymns with poetry of a literary and aesthetic kind'. On p. 31 Mr. Sastry asserts that 'mantras have two meanings, the inner which is psychological or spiritual and the true meaning and a gross or external meaning for common men' and he adds that the use of words with double meanings was *deliberate* but was *effortless* and *natural*.

1613. यथो एतदविस्पष्टार्था भवन्तीति। नैष स्थाणोरपराधो यदेनमन्धो न पश्यति पुरुषापराधः स भवति। निरुक्त I. 16.

Śrī Aurobindo admits (p. XXXIII) that there are some key words in the Ṛgveda such as *ṛta*, *kratu*, *śravas*, *ketu* and that elaborate work would have to be done to fix the meanings of such words. But he does not undertake a study of the key words (each of which except 'ketu' occurs hundreds of times in the Ṛgveda) by comparison of Ṛgvedic passages and considering the light shed on these words by the other Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. He mentions the occurrence of the word ṛta in I. 164. 47 and IV. 21. 3 (*sadanāt-ṛtasya*) and '*ṛtasya pathyā*' in Ṛg. III. 12. 7 and jumps to the conclusion that the last two words mean 'the path of truth' and remarks that 'we have to find the path of Truth' (Foreword p. XXX.). In the H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 2–5 it has been shown that ṛta in the Ṛgveda has three meanings, viz. (1) the regular and general order in the cosmos; (2) the correct and ordered way of the cult of the gods; (3) 'moral conduct of man.' In the Ṛgveda ṛta is not the same as 'satya', but the two are differentiated. In Ṛg. V. 51. 2 the Viśve-devas [1614] are described as ṛtadhītayaḥ (whose thoughts are fixed on ṛta) and 'satyadharmāṇaḥ' (whose ordinances are true or fixed) and the sage prays to them to come to his sacrifice and to drink (*ājya* and soma) by the tongue of Agni. In Ṛg. X. 190. 1 both ṛta and satya are said to have arisen from rigorous or refulgent *tapas* (of the Creator). In the Ṛgveda ṛta involved a very wide conception as stated above and 'satya' had a restricted meaning viz. truth or static order. In Ṛg. IX. 113. 4 Soma is described as one who proclaims ṛta, satya and śraddhā (faith). Therefore, Śrī. Aurobindo is quite inaccurate when he translates *ṛta* by the word 'Truth' and draws important conclusions from his inaccurate renderings. Similarly, Śrī. Aurobindo does not give a correct rendering when he translates (Foreword p. XXX) the word '*ṛtacit*' as truth-conscious (whatever that may mean acc. to Śrī. Aurobindo). Mr. Kapali Sastry (p. 46) goes a step further than his great master by stating that in the mantras true knowledge is termed 'ṛtacit' Truth-consciousness (with a capital C). It appears that both Master and disciple are misled by the meaning of 'cit' in such an attribute as 'sat-cit-ānanda', applied to *brahma*. They appear to take 'ṛta-cit' as meaning two distinct things 'ṛta' and 'cit'. The word 'ṛtacit' occurs

---

1614. ऋतधीतय आ गत सत्यधर्माणो अध्वरम्। अग्नेः पिबत जिह्वया ॥ ऋ. V. 51. 2; ऋतं च सत्यं चाभीद्धात्तपसोऽध्यजायत। ततो रात्र्यजायत ततः समुद्रो अर्णवः ॥ ऋ. X. 190.1; ऋतं वदन्नृतद्युम्न सत्यं वदन्सत्यकर्मन्। श्रद्धां वदन् सोम राजन् धात्रा सोम परिष्कृत इन्द्रायेन्दो परि स्रव ॥ ऋ. IX. 113. 4.

five times in the Ṛg.; in[1615] I. 145.5, IV. 3.4, V. 3. 9 ('ṛtacit is here an epithet of Agni), in VII 85. 4 (it is an adjective of hotṛ) and in IV. 16. 10 it qualifies the word *nārī* (in the context, Śacī, the wife of Indra). The present author wonders whether Śrī Aurobindo and his disciple cared to go into the meaning of 'ṛtacit' in the several verses where it occurs. They pay no attention to the word 'ṛṇacit' that occurs in Ṛg. II. 23. 17 as an attribute of Brahmaṇaspati.[1616].

The space at the author's disposal does not allow him to show up the other unwarranted propositions and conclusions of Śrī. Aurobindo and Mr. Kapali Sastry. The author will set out the final conclusion of Śrī. Aurobindo (Foreword p. XXIX) "what then is the secret meaning, the esoteric sense which emerges by this way of understanding the Veda? .... The thought around which all is centred is the seeking after Truth, Light, Immortality. There is a truth deeper and higher than the truth of outward existence, a Light greater and higher than the light of human understanding which comes by revelation and inspiration, an immortality towards which the soul has to rise. We have to find our way to that, to get into touch with this Truth and Immortality." This is a grand peroration, but all this is built on shaky and meagre foundations, such as the wrong meanings attached to the words ṛta and ṛtacit. Mr. Kapali Sastry (on p. 46) practically reproduces this grand summing up of his *guru*.

Mr. Kapali Sastry launches (on pp. 22–26) a bitter diatribe against Sāyaṇa but ultimately he has to admit (pp. 27–28) that Sāyaṇa is not merely useful, but indispensable to the students of the Veda. On p. 23 he translates a sūtra from Jaimini's work 'the purpose of the Veda being ritualistic, words which do not have that significance are useless' and remarks that this clearly lays down that the only purpose of the Vedas is that of ritual, those that do not pertain to that (ritualistic action) are worthless. The author doubts whether Mr. Kapali Sastry has carefully read the Pūrvamīmāṅsāsūtras or has at least

---

1615. व्यब्रवीद्वयुना मर्त्येभ्योऽग्निर्विद्वाँ ऋतचिद्धि सत्यः ॥ ऋ. I. 145. 5. It will be noticed that here ऋतचित् and सत्य are both epithets of Agni. They must be given some separate meanings; स सुक्रतुर्ऋतचिदस्तु होता य आदित्य शवसा वां नमस्वान्। ऋ. VII. 85. 4 (O sons of Aditi! May that Hotṛ priest, who makes obeisance to you with strength (in a loud voice), be a man of good deeds (or will) and knowing ṛta, moral conduct (or cosmic law). सत्यः in I. 145. 5 would have to be rendered as truthful or pure. The word चित् may be derived from root चि to gather or from चित् to know.

1616. स ऋणचिदृणया ब्रह्मणस्पतिर्द्रुहो हन्ता मह ऋतस्य धर्तरि ॥ ऋ. II. 23. 17.

correctly stated the position; what he quotes is the Pūrvapakṣa view (prima facie view). Jaimini's position is contained in the 7th sūtra[1617] 'as those passages (that do not directly concern themselves with ritualistic actions) form one syntactically connected whole with the passages prescribing *vidhis* they are to be considered as commendatory of the vidhis'. Mr. Sastry is not satisfied with saying (on p. 8) 'the sages Madhucchandas and others are *seers* of the mantra, the *Gods were present to the vision of these seers of old* ', but he adds 'this seer of the beyond is also the hearer of the truth; therefore that the poet-seers are truth-hearers *kavayaḥ satyaśrutaḥ*, is famous in the Veda' (p. 64). The present writer wonders whether Mr. Sastry carefully read the original passages where the words 'kavayaḥ satyaśrutaḥ' occur in the Veda. The words *kaviḥ* and *kavayaḥ* occur several hundred times in the Ṛgveda, but 'satyaśrutaḥ' occurs only thrice in Ṛg. V. 57. 8, V. 58. 8 and VI. 49. 6; Ṛg. V. 57. 8 and V. 58. 8 are identical. In Ṛg. V. 57. 8 and [1617a] V. 58. 8 it is the wind-gods (Maruts) that are addressed as *kavayaḥ* (wise) and *satyaśrutaḥ* (well-known as conferring true rewards) and *not sages*. VI. 49.6 (first half of which is addressed to Parjanya and Vāta-wind god) runs 'O establishers of the world! (O Maruts!) that are wise and well-known as conferring true rewards, make the world turn towards the man by whose lauds you are praised' (this half seems to be addressed to the band of Maruts). Further comment is superfluous.[1618]

1617. आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वादानर्थक्यमतदर्थानां तस्मादनित्यमुच्यते । ...विधिना त्वेकवाक्यत्वात्स्तुत्यर्थेन विधीनां स्युः ॥ पू. मी. सू. I. 2. 1 and 7.

1617a. हये नरो मरुतो मृळता नस्तुवीमघासो अमृता ऋतज्ञाः । सत्यश्रुतः कवयो युवानो बृहद्गिरयो बृहदुक्षमाणाः ॥ ऋ. V. 57. 8 and V. 58. 8; पर्जन्यवाता वृषभा पृथिव्याः पुरीषाणि जिन्वतमप्यानि । सत्यश्रुतः कवयो यस्य गीर्भिर्जगतः स्थातर्जगदा कृणुध्वम् ॥ ऋ. VI. 49. 6. All words including सत्यश्रुतः कवयः in the latter half of V. 57. 8 are epithets applied to Maruts in the first half. सत्यश्रुतः कवयः in the latter half of VI. 49. 6 are vocatives as the पदपाठ shows and are addressed to Maruts as in V. 57. 8 and V. 58. 8. The words सत्यश्रुतः कवयः do not refer at all to Vedic poets in any of the three cases.

1618. The present author is aware that thousands of people look upon Śri Aurobindo as a yogin, a prophet and as a World Teacher. But the search for truth is higher than all prophets and yogins put together. Śri Aurobindo and his disciple claim that he has received a new revelation about the Veda beyond the ken of all scholars of antiquity and modern times and they have very severely handled Yāska, Jaimini, Sāyaṇa and other commentators. The devotees and admirers of Śrī Aurobindo must allow the same freedom to the critics of Śrī Aurobindo's Vedic lucubrations for showing how and why they are wrong and are requested not to take umbrage at what the present writer has said about his theories but *only to reply to the author's brief criticisms* on their merits or demerits.

The Mīmāṁsakas made a sweeping generalisation that the whole Veda is meant for sacrifice. They went rather too far but they had substantial grounds for doing so. On pp. 980–982 of the H. of Dh. vol. II. it has been shown how even the Ṛgveda discloses that a complicated system of sacrifices with three *savanas*, numerous priests, three fires, existed in those far-off days and sacrifices like Atirātra (Ṛg. VII. 103. 7) and Trikadruka (Ṛg. I. 32. 3, II. 11. 17, VIII. 13, 18, VIII. 92. 21, X. 14. 16) were being performed. The Mīmāṁsakas had a long tradition behind them. But the case of Śrī Aurobindo's theories is entirely different. On flimsy grounds and mistaken meanings he builds up an imposing structure of an exoteric and also an esoteric meaning of vedic mantras, propounds that the sages wanted secrecy for their doctrines and all that they were concerned with was Truth, Light and Consciousness. It has been already shown that there are several philosophical and speculative hymns in the Ṛgveda. But there is no motive of secrecy therein. If it is only Truth, Light and Consciousness with which the vedic sages were concerned ten thousand verses would not have been necessary. One should like to know what secret or higher or deeper esoteric Truth or Light or Consciousness to be kept concealed from common men is contained in hymns such as Ṛg. VII. 55 (sleeping charm), VII. 103 (maṇḍūka-stuti), X. 34 (gambler's song), X. 119 (exhilaration of power of Soma on Indra), X. 166 (invoking destruction of enemies), X. 190 (brief creation hymn), X. 191 (for concord and co-operation). Many more such hymns may be cited, where the theory of secrecy and Truth, Light and Consciousness would entirely fail. Besides, what is the secret (or spiritual or esoteric) element in such passages as those quoted above viz. I. 164. 46, X. 129. 2, VIII. 58. 2, which clearly express the most profound Truth. If the Mīmāṁsakas made a too wide generalization, Śrī Aurobindo makes a far wider generalization with very little basis.

The mantras of the Ṛgveda have a meaning and are not unmeaning letters as often in Tāntrik works. There is a discussion in Nirukta I. 15–16 where it is said that in the absence of the Nirukta the apprehension of the meaning of the words used in mantras would not follow and the view of Kautsa is cited that the Nirukta is useless for understanding the meaning of mantras, since the mantras themselves have no sense (or are useless or purposeless). Yāska[1618a] replies that mantras do possess

1618a. अथापीदमन्तरेण मन्त्रेष्वर्थप्रत्ययो न विद्यते। ...तदिदं विद्यास्थानं व्याकरणस्य कार्त्स्न्यं स्वार्थसाधकं च। ...अर्थवन्तः शब्दसामान्यात्। ...यथो एतद् ब्राह्मणेन रूपसम्पन्ना

(*Continued on next page*)

a meaning since they employ the very same words that are used in ordinary Sanskrit, and then quotes a passage of the Ait. Br. (I. 5). Śabara on Jai. I. 2. 41 states that where one cannot get at the meaning one has to come to some meaning on a consideration of other Vedic passages and on the basis of roots following Nirukta and Grammar.

One of the important topics dwelt upon at length in the Purāṇas is that of *avatāras*. This emphasis on the conception of avatāras has greatly influenced the forms of religious worship, vratas and festivals. The subject of avatāras has been dealt with in the H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 717–724. It has been shown there that the beginnings of the doctrine of avatāras and of some of the well-known avatāras may be traced to the Vedic Literature viz. to the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (story of Manu and the fish in I. 8. 1. 1–6), story of Kūrma (tortoise) in Śatapatha VII. 5. 1. 5, of Varāha (Boar) in Śat. Br. XIV. 1. 2. 11, Vāmana (Dwarf) in Śat. Br. I. 2. 5. 1 ff., Kṛṣṇa, son of Devakī, in Chān. Up. III. 17. 6 and that the number of avatāras and the names also varied. But the treatment was not exhaustive and hence some details are added here from the Purāṇas and from general considerations.

Avatāra (from root *tṛ*. with 'ava') means 'descending' or 'descent' and the word is applied to gods, assuming the form of a human being or even of an animal and continuing to live in that form till the purpose for which that form was assumed was carried out. Reincarnation is one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. But there is a vast difference between that doctrine and the Hindu theory. Re-incarnation in Christianity is single and unique, while in the Hindu theory as adumbrated in the Gītā (IV. 5–8) and the Purāṇas there have been many incarnations of the Deity and there may he many more in future. It is a comforting belief for ordinary men to hold that when the affairs of the world are in a mess God comes down to the earth to set matters right. And this belief is held not only by the Hindus and Buddhists but by many peoples (including some in the rich and educated West) far apart from each other. Most Hindus, however, do not believe that great

---

(*Continued from last page*)

विधीयन्त इति, उदिताऽनुवादः स भवति । एतद्वै यज्ञस्य समृद्धं यद्रूपसमृद्धं यत्कर्म क्रियमाणमृगभिवदति। निरुक्त I. 15–16 ; अविशिष्टस्तु वाक्यार्थः । जै. I. 2. 32 ; अविशिष्टस्तु लोके प्रयुज्यमानानां वेदे च पदानामर्थः । सं यथैव लोके विवक्षितस्तथैव वेदेपि भवितुमर्हति । ...अर्थप्रत्यायनार्थमेव यज्ञे मन्त्रोच्चारणम् । शबर's भाष्य.

men, saints or prophets like Śaṅkarācārya, Nānak, Shivaji or Mahātmā Gandhi are born again as avatāras in times of crisis. The Buddhists made Buddha in their Mahāyāna teachings go through many avatāras as *bodhisattva* before he attained Buddhahood. In modern times many persons pose or are made to pose as avatāras by their admirers or followers. Recently, Mr. J. G. Bennett (Hodder and Stoughton, 1958) has published a book called 'Subud' (Sushila, Buddha, Dharma) in which he suggests his firm belief that one Pak Subuh who hails from Indonesia is an *avatar*, the messenger from above for whom mankind is waiting. The Indian theory of avatāras is connected with the theory about yugas and manvantaras. When the world is in serious trouble, people believe that deliverance will come by the grace of God and they are often justified in their belief by the appearance of godly men who appear with some noble mission and masterly idea suited to the particular time and place when they appear.

In medieval and modern times the avatāras of Viṣṇu have been regarded as ten, viz. Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Nṛsiṁha or Narasiṁha (Man-lion), Vāmana, Paraśurāma, Rāma (son of Daśaratha), Kṛṣṇa, Buddha and Kalkin. The Varāha-purāṇa mentions these ten in that order.[1619] In an inscription on the lintel above the figure of Śaṅkara-Nārāyaṇa in the Varāha-Perumal[1620] temple, this Paurāṇik verse except the first six letters (which cannot be read) is seen inscribed. The *locus classicus* about the descent of God in different forms is in the Bhagavadgītā[1621] viz. 'Whenever piety or righteousness (*dharma*)

1619. मत्स्यः कूर्मो वराहश्च नरसिंहोथ वामनः। रामो रामश्च कृष्णश्च बुद्धः कल्की च ते दश॥ वराह 4. 2, मत्स्य 285. 6–7 (reads कल्कीति च क्रमात्). The मत्स्य verse is quoted by अपरार्क p. 338.

1620. Vide Memoir No. 26 of the Archaeological Survey of India by H. Krishna Sastri on two statues of Pallava kings and five Pallava Inscriptions in a rock-cut temple at Mahābalipuram (p. 5), which the writer ascribes to the latter half of 7th century A. D. The preserved engraving reads "'हस्य नारसिंहश्च वामनः। रामो रामस्य (श्च) रामस्य (श्व?) बुद्ध (:) कल्की च ते दश॥. The same page notes that at Sirpur in the Central Provinces is a shrine of about 8th century A. D. in which are found side by side the images of Rāma and Buddha in his usual meditative attitude.

1621. यदा यदा हि धर्मस्य...सृजाम्यहम्। परित्राणाय साधूनां ...धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय सम्भवामि युगे युगे॥ गीता 4. 7–8; compare हरिवंश I. 41. 17 'यदा यदा ...भारत। धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय तदा सम्भवति प्रभुः॥'; जज्ञे पुनः पुनर्विष्णुर्यज्ञे च शिथिले प्रभुः। कर्तुं धर्मव्यवस्थानमधर्मस्य च नाशनम्॥ वायु 98. 69, मत्स्य 47. 235 (reads धर्मे प्रशिथिले and असुराणां प्रणाशनम्); बह्वीः संसरमाणो वै योनीर्वर्तामि सत्तम। धर्मसंरक्षणार्थाय धर्मसंस्थापनाय

(*Continued on next page*)

declines and impiety grows up, I create myself. Age after age I am born for the protection of the good, for the destruction of evil-doers and the establishment of piety'. The same idea occurs in some of the *parvans* of the Mahābhārata, as in Vanaparva 272. 71 and Āśvamedhika-parva 54. 13. None of the ten avatāras, except those of Kṛṣṇa and probably Rāma, ('Rāmaḥ śastrabhṛtām-aham', Gītā X. 31) are, however, mentioned by name in the Bhagavad-gītā. The number and names of the avatāras are not uniform in the Mahābhārata. In the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śāntiparva (chap. 339. verses 77–102) only six avatāras and their exploits are expressly mentioned, viz. Varāha (bringing up the earth submerged in the ocean), Narasiṁha (killing demon Hiraṇyakaśipu), Vāmana (vanquishing Bali and making him dwell in Pātāla), Bhārgava Rāma (extirpating kṣatriyas), Rāma, son of Daśaratha (killing Rāvaṇa), Kṛṣṇa (killing or vanquishing Kaṁsa, Narakāsura, Bāṇa, Kālayavana, Jarāsandha, Śiśupāla). Then the same chapter [1622] mentions ten avatāras as follows: Haṁsa, Kūrma, Matsya, Varāha, Narasiṁha, Vāmana, Rāma (Bhārgava), Rāma Dāśarathi, Sātvata, Kalki. Here Buddha is omitted and Kṛṣṇa is called Sātvata and Haṁsa is added. In the Harivaṁśa [1623] it is said that the past avatāras have been thousands and in future also they would be thousands. Śāntiparva says the same thing. The Harivaṁśa (I. 41. 27 ff) names only the following and their exploits, viz. Varāha, Narasiṁha, Vāmana, Dattātreya, Jāmadagnya (Paraśurama), Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and Vedavyāsa. But as Keśava is said to be the 9th (I. 41. 6) it is to be understood that Matsya and Kūrma were counted, though not expressly named and Kalki Viṣṇuyaśas is mentioned as a

---

(Continued from last page)

च । आश्वमेधिक 54. 13; असतां निग्रहार्थाय धर्मसंरक्षणाय च । अवतीर्णो मनुष्याणामजायत यदुक्षये ॥ स एवं भगवान् विष्णुः कृष्णेति परिकीर्त्यते । वनपर्व 272. 71–72. ब्रह्मपु० (180. 26–27 and 181. 2–4) has almost the same words as गीता. देवीभागवत (VII. 39). 22–23 is यदा यदा···र्भवति भूधर । अभ्यु···तदा वेषान् बिभर्म्यहम् ॥.

1622. हंसः कूर्मश्च मत्स्यश्च प्रादुर्भावाद् द्विजोत्तम । वराहो नरसिंहश्च वामनो राम एव च ॥ रामो दाशरथिश्चैव सात्वतः कल्किरेव च ॥ शान्ति 339. 103–104. In आदि 218. 12 वासुदेव is called सात्वत.

1623. प्रादुर्भावसहस्राणि अतीतानि न संशयः । भूयश्चैव भविष्यन्तीत्येवमाह प्रजापतिः ॥ हरिवंश I. 41. 11; अतिक्रान्ताश्च बहवः प्रादुर्भावा ममोत्तमाः ॥ शान्ति 339. 106. Vide भागवत I. 3. 26 and अग्नि 16. 11–12 for similar words.

future avatāra. The usual ten avatāras are named in Varāha[1624] (4. 2, 48. 17–22, 55. 36–37), Matsya 285. 6–7, Agni (chap. 2–16 stories about all ten), Narasiṁhapurāṇa (chap. 36), Padma VI. 43. 13–15). In Vāyu 98. 68–104 the text presents the avatāras in a confused manner and appears to mention ten avatāras, viz. Varāha, Narasiṁha, Vāmana, Dattātreya, Māndhātṛ, Jāmadagnya, Rāma (Dāśarathi), Veda-vyāsa, Vāsudeva, Kalkin Viṣṇuyaśas. In Brahmāṇḍa III. 73. 75 ff there are lists of avatāras different from the present ten. In the Bhāgavata the avatāras of Viṣṇu are mentioned in several places. In I. 3. 1–25 twenty-two avatāras including Brahmā, Devarṣi Nārada (who promulgated the Sātvata system), Nara-Nārāyaṇa, Kapila (who taught to Āsuri the Sāṅkhya system), Dattātreya, Ṛṣabha, (son of Nābhi and Merudevi),[1625] Dhanvantari, Mohinī, Vedavyāsa, Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa, Buddha, Kalki are mentioned. In II. 7 twenty-three avatāras are mentioned, many of which are the same as in I. 3, but in II. 7 Dhruva, Pṛthu son of Vena, Hayagrīva are mentioned, the first two of which are mentioned as avatāras hardly anywhere else. In Bhāgavata XI. 40. 17–22 the following avatāras are mentioned, viz. Matsya, Hayaśīrṣa, Kūrma, Sūkara, Narasiṁha, Vāmana, Bhārgava Rāma, Rāma, Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, Aniruddha, Buddha, Kalki. In Bhāgavata XI. 4. 17–22 sixteen avatāras are set out, viz. usual ten plus Haṁsa, Datta (Dattātreya), Kumāra (Nārada), Ṛṣabha, Vyāsa and Hayagrīva. Twelve avatāras are noted in Matsya 99. 14 and Padma V. 13. 182–186. The Prapañcasāratantra (ascribed to the great advaita teacher Śaṅkarācārya) mentions (in Paṭala 20. 59) Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Nṛsiṁha, Kubja (i. e. Vāmana), three Rāmas

---

1624. The passage of Matsya (285. 6–7) is very likely a later interpolation, because in another place in the Matsya, the names of avatāras are different. In Matsya 47. 106 there is a reference to the curse on Viṣṇu by Bhṛgu that since Viṣṇu killed his wife he would have to be born seven times as a human being and the seven avatāras are Dattātreya, Māndhātā, Jāmadagnya (Bhārgava) Rāma, Rāma Dāśarathi, Vedavyāsa, Buddha, Kalkin and three more (in 47. 237–240), viz. Nārāyaṇa, Narasiṁha and Vāmana are added; in Matsya 54. 15–19, Nakṣatrapuruṣa-vrata is described and the usual ten avatāras are named.

1625. Ṛṣabha, son of Nābhi, appears to be the first tīrthaṅkara of the Jainas and was probably raised to the status of an incarnation of Viṣṇu as Buddha was raised. In भागवत I. 3. 24 बुद्ध is referred to as follows: ततः कलौ संप्रवृत्ते संमोहाय सुरद्विषाम्। बुद्धो नाम्नाऽजनसुतः कीकटेषु भविष्यति॥, नमो बुद्धाय शुद्धाय दैत्यदानवमोहिने। भागवत X. 40. 22.

(i. e. Bhārgavarāma, Dāśarathi Rāma and Balarāma), Kṛṣṇa and Kalkin (i. e. it omits Buddha). The Ahirbudhnya Saṁhita (5. 50–57) enumerates 39 avatāras of Vāsudeva, that are set out by Otto Schrader in his Introduction to the Pañcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā, pp. 42–43. The Viṣṇupurāṇa[1626] states that Lakṣmī follows Viṣṇu in his avatāras. The Purāṇas are full of the descriptions of the exploits of Viṣṇu in his several avatāras. But it should not be supposed that Śiva had no avatāras. The Vāyu (chap. 23) mentions 28 avatāras of Maheśvara the last of which was Nakulī (Lakulī) as verse 221 says. In Varāha 15. 10–19 all avatāras are praised except that of Buddha. But Varāha (48. 20–22) provides that worship of Narasiṁha frees men from the fear of sins, of Vāmana leads to removal of delusion, of Paraśurāma to wealth, one should worship Dāśarathi Rāma for the destruction of cruel enemies, one desirous of a son should worship Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa, one who desires a handsome form should worship Buddha and one should worship Kalkin for the slaughter of enemies.[1627] The Agnipurāṇa (chap. 49. 1–9) describes what characteristics the images of the ten avatāras should possess and says that the image of Buddha should be represented as having a quiet face, long ear-lobes, fair complexion, wearing an upper garment, seated in Padmāsana posture and his hands should have the *varada* and *abhaya* poses.

From the facts that Kṣemendra in his Daśāvatāra-carita[1628] (composed in 1066 A. D.), and the Gītagovinda of Jayadeva (court poet of Lakṣmaṇasena) mention the usual ten avatāras with Fish as the first and that the Matsya passage about ten avatāras is quoted by Aparārka (first half of 12th century), it follows that all the ten avatāras of Viṣṇu had become recognised throughout India at least about the 10th century A. D.

1626. एवं यथा जगत्स्वामी देवराजो जनार्दनः। अवतारं करोत्येष तथा श्रीस्तत्सहायिनी ॥ पुनश्च पद्मादुद्भूता यदादित्योऽभवद्धरिः। यदा च भार्गवो रामस्तदाभूद्धरणी त्वियम् । राघवत्वेऽभवत्सीता रुक्मिणी कृष्णजन्मनि । अन्येषु चावतारेषु विष्णोरेषा सहायिनी ॥ विष्णु I. 9. 139–141 ; आदित्य means वामन here.

1627. शान्तात्मा लम्बकर्णश्च गौराङ्गश्चाम्बरावृतः। ऊर्ध्वं पद्मस्थितो बुद्धो वरदाभयदायकः ॥ अग्नि 49. 8; बृहत्संहिता 57. 4 पद्माङ्कितकरचरणः प्रसन्नमूर्तिः सुनीचकेशश्च । पद्मासनोपविष्टो पितेव जगतो भवति बुद्धः ॥; vide वराह 48. 20–22 वामनं मोहनाशाय वित्तार्थे जमदग्निजम् । क्रूरशत्रुविनाशाय यजेद्दाशरथिं बुधः । बलकृष्णौ यजेद्धीमान् पुत्रकामो न संशयः । रूपकामो भजेद् बुद्धं शत्रुघाताय कल्किनम् ॥.

1628. मत्स्यः कूर्मो वराहः पुरुषहरिवपुर्वामनो जामदग्न्यः काकुत्स्थः कंसहन्ता स च सुगतमुनिः कल्किनामा च विष्णुः ॥ दशावतारचरित I. 2.

Kumārila (7th century A. D.) did not accept Buddha as an avatāra, though about that century some people had come to recognize him as such (vide note 1629). Besides, as shown above, there were many views about the total number of avatāras, their names and the order in which they appeared. Vide Dr. Katre's paper in Allahabad University Studies, vol. X, pp. 37–130 for discussion on 33 avatāras. The Varāha avatāra is mentioned in the Eran stone Boar[1629] Inscription of Toramāṇa (Gupta inscriptions pp. 158–160) in the first quarter of the 6th century. The Raghuvaṁśa (IV. 53 and 58) refers to the recovery of land near the Sahya mountain from the Western Sea by Rāma (Bhārgava); vide pp. 89–90 and note 224 above for references in the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas to Paraśurāma's exploits. The *Sarvānukramaṇī p. 42 on Ṛg. X, 110 names as ṛṣi Jamadagni or* his son Rāma The Meghadūta mentions the planting of the left foot of Viṣṇu on Bali (i. e. the Vāmana avatāra). Māgha in Śiśupāla-vadha (XV. 58) regards Bodhisattva (Buddha) as an avatāra of Hari and as sought to be tempted by the hordes of Māra. Māgha[1630] flourished about 725–775 A. D. The knowledge of Vāmana and Kṛṣṇa avatāras can be carried back centuries before the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, since it refers to works and dramatic representations of the imprisonment of Bali and the killing of Kaṁsa (vide pp. 130, 203 and notes 330, 521 above). In the Daśāvatāra cave at Ellora one sees the representations of Varāha, Narasiṁha, Vāmana and Kṛṣṇa. These caves are ascribed to the 8th century A. D.[1631] Therefore, it appears almost certain that some at least (viz. Vāmana, Paraśurāma and Kṛṣṇa) of the usual ten avatāras had been recognised some centuries before Christ and all ten had come to be recognised by some writers and other people before the 7th century A. D.

1629. The first verse of the Inscription is: जयति धरण्युद्धरणे घनघोणाघातघूर्णितमहीध्रः । देवो वराहमूर्तिस्त्रैलोक्यमहागृहस्तम्भः ॥ Gupta Inscriptions p. 159, This was engraved in the first year of the Hūṇa king तोरमाण's reign on 10th of Phālguna, when the temple of Nārāyaṇa in his Boar avatāra was built. The probable date is about 500 to 510 A. D. This अवतार is sometimes called आदिवराह, यज्ञवराह, श्वेतवराह, महावराह. Compare हर्षचरित III 'महावराहपीवरस्कन्धःपीठे नरकासुर इव भुवो गर्भोद्भूतः ।'. Vide 'Royal conquests and cultural migrations' by C. Śivarāma Mūrti (Calcuttā, 1955) for plate II C. for 'Ādivarāha' of 4th century A. D.

1630. इति तत्तदा विकृतरूपमभजदविभिन्नचेतसम् । मारबलमिव भयङ्करतां हरिबोधिसत्त्वमभिराजमण्डलम् ॥ शिशुपालवध XV. 58. For Māgha's date, vide the author's 'History of Sanskrit Poetics' (1951) pp. 112–113 and 139.

1631. Vide 'Cave Temples of India' by Fergusson and Burgess p. 438; Archaeological Survey of Western India by Burgess, Vol. V. p. 25.

The conception of avatāras contributed largely to the increase of Dharmaśāstra material. They gave rise to numerous vratas and festivals. For example, the Varāhapurāṇa devotes chapters 39–48 to dvādaśī-vratas in honour of the ten avatāras from Matsya to Kalkin. There are separate festivals called Jayantīs of the avatāras such as Narasiṁha-jayantī on Vaiśākha śu. 14, Paraśurāma-jayantī (on Vaiśākha śu. 3). Vide pp. 262–263 for the tithis and months in which the different avatāras appeared.[1631a]

Descriptions of each of the ten well-known avatāras occur in several Purāṇas; for example, Matsya avatāra is described in Matsya chap. 1–2, Agni 2, Narasiṁha 37; Kūrma in Agni 3, Bhāgavata I. 3. 16, VIII. 7–8–10, Narasiṁha 38; Varāha in Matsya 247–248, Vāyu 6. 11–26, Bhāgavata III. 13. 18–45, III. 19. 25–30, Narasiṁha 39; Narasiṁha avatāra in Brahma 58. 12 ff., 213. 43 ff., Matsya 161–163, Bhāgavata I. 3. 18, VII. 8. 18, Narasiṁha-purāṇa 41–44; Vāmana in Brahma 73 and 213. 80–185, Vāyu 98, 74–87, Vāmanapurāṇa 78. 51, Bhāgavata VIII. 18. 12 to VIII. 22. 33, Narasiṁha 45; Paraśurāma in Matsya 244–246, Bhāgavata IX. 15. 13, IX. 16. 1–26 and vide above pp. 89–90 and note 204; Rāma in Brahma 176, Agni 5–11 (the seven *kāṇḍas* of the Rāmāyaṇa are summarised), Vāyu 88. 183–198, Bhāg. IX. 10–11, Padma IV. 1–68, Narasiṁha 47–52; Kṛṣṇa in Brahma 14–17, 180–212, Agni 12–15, Bhāg. X. 3, 44–45, 50–52 &c., XI. 1 and 30, Narasiṁha 53; Buddha in Brahma 180. 27–39, Agni 16. 1–3, Varāha 180. 27–29, 213. 32 ff., Padma VI. 31. 13–15, Bhāg. I. 3. 24; Kalkin—Vide H. of Dh. III. pp. 923–925 for references. The avatāras and their *jayantīs* are described in many Dharmaśāstra works, but the Ṭodarānanda, vol. I. edited by Dr. P. L. Vaidya in the Ganga Oriental Series probably contains the longest account of the ten avatāras (pp. 39–386). Thousands of verses are devoted by the Purāṇas to each of the topics of *dāna* (gifts), śrāddha, tīrtha and vrata and they have been quoted at length by works on Dharmaśāstra. It would be

---

1631 a. The following verse is cited from the पुराणसमुच्चय in नि. सि. p. 81 : मत्स्योऽभूद्धुतभुग्दिने मधुसिते, कूर्मो विधौ माधवे, वाराहो गिरिजासुते नभसि, यच्छुक्ले सिते माधवे । सिंहो, भाद्रपदे सिते हरितिथौ श्रीवामनो, माधवे रामो गौरितिथावतः परमभूद् रामो नवम्यां मधोः ॥ कृष्णोष्टम्यां नभसि सितपरे, चाश्विने यद्दशम्यां बुद्धः, कल्की नभसि समभूच्छुक्लषष्ठ्यां क्रमेण ॥. *The* भक्तिप्रकाश *p. 79 (of the* वीरमित्रोदय*) also quotes* this. The नि. सि. remarks that others cite some stray verses where some of the tithis are different and that some Koṅkaṇa writers cite some verses as occurring in वराहपुराण in which मत्स्यजयन्ती is on आषाढशुक्ल eleventh, Buddha should be worshipped on पौषशुक्ल 7th and so on.

best to bring together by way of illustration a few of the pages of the previous volumes of the History of Dharmaśāstra on these subjects.

Vide vol. II. pp. 880–881 (for gifts of certain dānas called *dhenus* from Matsya chap. 82, Varāha, chap. 99–110, Agni, chap. 210), p. 882 (for gifts called parvata or meru from Matsya 83-92, Agni 210 quoted by Aparārka pp. 344–454), pp. 884–885 (for grahaśānti from Matsya 93 and about images of planets from Matsya 84), p. 892 (for dedication of a reservoir of water to the public from Matsya 58), pp. 895–896 for the planting of trees and the dedication of a garden to the public (Matsya 59, Agni 70), pp. 896–899 (for dedication of temples and consecration of images in Matsya 264–266, Agni 60 and 66); vol. IV. pp. 162–164 about various hells (Agni 203, 371, Brahma 22, 214–215, Brahmavaivarta, Prakṛtikhaṇḍa 29 and 33, Nāradapurāṇa I. 15, Padma IV. 227, Bhaviṣya, Brāhmaparva 192, Bhāgavata V. 26, Viṣṇu V. 6, Mārkaṇḍeya 12 and 14); vol. IV. p. 170 about heaven being really happiness of the mind (Brahma 22. 44 and 47, Viṣṇu IV. 6. 46); vol. IV. pp. 177–178 on the doctrine of Karmavipāka (Vāmana 12, Mārkaṇḍeya 15, Varāha 203, Viṣṇudharmottara II. 102); vol. IV. p. 181 on the signs of approaching death (Vāyu 19, Liṅga 91, Mārk. 43. 29–39 or chap. 40 of Venk. ed. and Viṣṇudharmottara III. 218); vol. IV. p. 212 on cremation (Varāha 187, Garuḍa II. 4); vol. IV. p. 256 on the persons entitled to perform funeral rites (Viṣṇu III. 13, Mārk. chap. 30 of B. I. ed. and 27 of Venk. ed.); vol. IV. pp. 261–262 the rites after death being called pūrva or nava, madhyama (navamiśra) and uttara (or purāṇa) in Viṣṇupurāṇa III. 13; vol. IV. p. 265 about an ātivāhika body being assumed by the soul of a dead person (Brahma 214, Mārk. 16, Agni 230 and 371); vol. IV. p. 272 on āśauca (impurity on birth and death) from Kūrma II. 23, Liṅga I. 89, Garuḍa, pretakhaṇḍa 5, Agni 157–158, Vāmana 14. It is unnecessary to refer to the pages of this volume itself for numerous references to Purāṇas as regards tithis, various vratas, times for religious rites, astrological matters &c.

It should not be supposed that the Purāṇas are restricted to topics called religious in popular parlance and to the five characteristic topics of creation, re-creation (*sarga, pratisarga* &c.) Some of the Purāṇas contain an exhaustive treatment of the duties of kings, ministers, commander-in-chief, judge, envoy scribes, court physician and of coronation, invasion &c

Many of these matters have already been dealt with in vol. III. of the H. of Dh. The most exhaustive treatment of what may be called political matters is found in Matsya chap. 215-226 and 240, Agni 218-242, Viṣṇudharmottara II, chap. 2-7, 18-21, 24-26, 28, 61-63, 66-72, 145-152, 177. Among other Purāṇas Garuḍa I. 108-115, Mārkaṇḍeya 24 (in Venk. ed, or 27 in Banerji's ed.), Kālikā 87 contain some discussion of matters political. It should be noticed that both Matsya (240. 2) and Agni (228. 1) employ the two technical words, 'Ākranda' and 'Pārṣṇigrāha' that are part of the theory of *Maṇḍala* in Kauṭilya (VI. 2. p. 260) explained in H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 222. The Matsyapurāṇa is profusely quoted by one of the earliest extant digests on Dharmaśāstra viz. the Kṛtyakalpataru on Rājadharma (pp. 23, 25-30, 34-38, 42-43, 55-61, 118-122, 123-124, 158-161 and many verses from chap. 227 and 241 of the Matsya on the administration of justice in Vyavahārakāṇḍa pp. 342, 345, 348, 377, 406, 409-10, 562, 581, 594-95, 599). The same digest quotes many verses (pp. 9-13, 128, 166, 178-181) from the Brahmapurāṇa which are not found in the printed Brahma (Ānan. ed.), but which are quoted by the Rājanītiprakāśa of Mitramiśra (borrowing from Kṛtyakalpataru) pp. 138, 158, 283, 416-419 and some by the Rājadharmakaustubha of Anantadeva (pp. 326-330). The Viṣṇudharmottara on rājadharma is not quoted in the Kṛtyakalpataru on rājadharma, but it is frequently quoted by the Rājanītiprakāśa e. g. Vi. Dh. II. 18. 1, 5-14 are quoted by R. N. P. on pp. 32-33, Vi. Dh. II. 18. 2-4 are quoted by R. N. P. p. 61, Vi. Dh. II. 22. 1-185 are quoted by R. N. P. pp. 66-81 (on mantras to be recited and the several divinities to be invoked at a king's coronation), Vi. Dh. II. 23. 1-13 are quoted by R. N. P. on pp. 82-83 (describing the rewards of the mantras recited in Vi. Dh. II. 22). Vi. Dh. is quoted 21 times by the Rājadharma-kaustubha. These three Purāṇas alone (Matsya, Agni, Viṣṇudharmottara) devote several thousand verses to the topic of rāja-dharma and allied matters. The Garuḍa-purāṇa (I. 108-115) devotes about four hundred verses to Rājanīti (political thought) but many of them are like subhāṣitas (*bon mots*) and are borrowed from Manu (e. g. Garuḍa I. 109. 1 and 52, 110. 7, 115. 63 are respectively Manu VII. 213, VIII. 26, II. 239, IX. 3), the Mahābhārata, the Nāradasmṛti (e. g. 'na sā sabhā' in Garuḍa 115. 52 is Nārada III. 18). The Garuḍa itself states that it will expound the essence of *nīti* (Rājadharma) based upon Artha-

śāstra[1632] and the like; while the colophons at the end of chapters 108–114 aver that they contain the Nītisāra promulgated by Bṛhaspati. One verse is almost the same as the Introductory verse 5 of Bāṇa's Kādambarī[1633] and I am disposed to hold that it is the Garuḍa that is the borrower.

Certain verses from the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa (24. 5, 23–33 or chap. 27 and 21–31 in Banerji's ed.) are quoted by R. N. P. pp. 30–31 (about the duties of kings and their acting in the peculiar ways of five gods, viz. Indra, Sūrya, Yama, Soma and Vāyu). The Dāyabhāga quotes the Markaṇḍeya-purāṇa for pointing out that *sāpiṇḍya* in the matter of inheritance and succession is different from sāpiṇḍya for the periods of aśauca (impurity on death[1634]). The Kṛtyakalpataru on Rājadharma (pp. 182–183) quotes a passage from Skandapurāṇa on the festival of Kaumudīmahotsava to be celebrated by the king. The same passage is quoted by R. N. P. pp. 419–421.

The Kṛtyakalpataru (on Rājadharma) quotes a long passage (pp. 201–212) from Bhaviṣyapurāṇa on '*Vasordhārā*', which is quoted by the R.N.P. (pp. 447–457) from the Devīpurāṇa. The Kālikāpurāṇa in chapter 87 devotes 131 verses to Rājanīti, in which a summary is furnished of the course of conduct that should be followed by the king. This chapter expressly mentions the works of Uśanas and Bṛhaspati (verses 99 and 130) and advises the king to honour brāhmaṇas that are advanced in knowledge, learning, *tapas* and age, to control his senses, to employ the four *upāyas* (sāma, dāna, daṇḍa and bheda), to avoid the vices of gambling, drinking, indulgence in sexual matters and hunting, to practise the six guṇas (yāna, āsana &c.), to test the princes, councillors, the queens and other female relatives by *upadhās* (investigation of character by various tricks).[1635]

1632. नीतिसारं प्रवक्ष्यामि अर्थशास्त्रादिसंश्रितम्। राजादिभ्यो हितं पुण्यमायुःस्वर्गादिदायकम्॥ गरुड I. 108. 1.

1633. अकारणाविष्कृतकोपधारिणः खलाद्भयं कस्य न नाम जायते। विषं महाहेर्विषमस्य दुर्वचः सुदुःसहं संनिपतेत्सदा मुखे॥ गरुड I. 112. 16; compare कादम्बरी Introductory verse 5 'अकारणाविष्कृतवैरदारुणादसज्जनात् कस्य भयं न जायते। विषं महाहेरिव यस्य दुर्वचः सुदुःसहं संनिहितं सदा मुखे॥'.

1634. अशौचाद्यर्थं तु पिण्डलेपभुजामपि तद्दत्तपिण्डलेपभोक्तृत्वेन सापिण्ड्यं मार्कण्डेयपुराणे निर्दिष्टं यथा—'पिण्डलेपभुजश्चान्ये पितामहपितामहात्। प्रभृत्युक्तास्त्रयस्तेषां यजमानश्च सप्तमः॥ इत्येवं मुनिभिः प्रोक्तः सम्बन्धः साप्तपौरुषः।' अशौचकर इत्यर्थः। दायभाग XI para 41. The verses 'पिण्डलेप…साप्तपौरुषः' are मार्कण्डेय 28. 4–5 with slightly differrent readings (chap. 31 in B. I.).

1635. Compare the heading of कौटिल्य I. 10 'उपधाभिः शौचाशौचज्ञानममात्यानाम्' and the following passages; क्षीरस्वामी, while commenting on the word उपधा, quotes this heading about उपधा from कौटिल्य (expressly named):

It appears that Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra was not available to most medieval writers and therefore they relied on the purāṇas for the treatment of Rājadharma. But the early purāṇas like the Matsya appear to have made use of Kauṭilya's work. Vide the author's paper on 'Kauṭilya and the Matsya-purāṇa' in Dr. B. C. Law presentation volume II. pp. 13-15.

In the matter of the administration of justice and the law of succession and inheritance also some of the Purāṇas have influenced the views of writers of *nibandhas*. The Kṛtyakalpataru on Vyavahāra quotes about twelve verses from the Kālikā-purāṇa on the marks of a truthful party or witness and on the appropriate ordeals in the case of the several varṇas,[1636] their procedure and the different causes of action (vide pp. 79, 205, 210, 211, 221, 231, 238). Three verses from the Kālikā (chap. 91. 35-37) about the twelve kinds of sons and the impropriety of making a punarbhava, svayamdatta and a *dāsa* successor to a kingdom are quoted in the R. N. P. pp. 35 and 42. Verses 38-41 of Kālikā, chapter 91, about the sons that can be adopted and the age up to which they can be adopted are quoted by the Dattakamīmāṁsā p. 60 (Ānan. ed.) and by the Vyavahāramayūkha p. 114, though the latter remarks that they were not found in two or three mss. of the Purāṇa.[1637] In connection with the question of the seniority among twins the Mayūkha quotes Śrīdhara's comment on Bhāgavata (III. 19. 18) that the son born first is the younger one; but the Vyavahāramayūkha[1638] makes the interesting remark that in the Purāṇas practices opposed to the smṛtis are frequently seen.

1636. The three verses on pp. 210-211 beginning with 'paradārābhiśāpe' &c. in Kṛtyakalpataru are quoted also by the Vyavahāramayūkha p. 45 and the Rājadharmakaustubha p. 408.

1637. यत्तु कालिकापुराणे—पितुर्गोत्रेण यः पुत्रः'''गृहीत्वा पञ्चवर्षीयं पुत्रेष्टिं प्रथमं चरेत्॥ तदसगोत्रपरम्। '''इदं तु वचो न तथा विश्रम्भणीयं द्वित्रकालिकापुराणपुस्तकेष्वदर्शनात्। व्य. म. 114 (B. O. R. I. ed. 1926).

1638. यत्तु—द्वौ तदा भवतो गर्भौ सूतिर्वेशविपर्ययात्—इत्यादिना भागवते पश्चाज्जातस्य ज्यैष्ठ्यमुक्तं तदप्यनेन बाध्यते। पुराणेषु स्मृतिविरुद्धाचाराणां बहुशो दर्शनात्। व्य. म. p. 98.

CHAPTER XXV

Causes of the Disappearance of Buddhism from India.

At the beginning of Chapter XXIV (pp. 913-14, n 1448) above, it was stated that the Purāṇas had a large share in bringing about the final disappearance of Buddhism from India, the land of its birth. The disappearance of Buddhism from India was complete and seemed to be sudden and is a complex problem. No single cause, nor even a few causes can fully account for this phenomenon. A combination of causes, both internal and external, must have been in operation for a pretty long time to bring about this remarkable event. It may be admitted that some of the causes are more or less conjectural. In the first quarter of the 5th century A. D. Fa-Hian found Buddhism in a flourishing condition in India, while in the first half of the 7th century A. D. Yuan Chwang appears to say that the decline of Buddhism had set in. It-sing found Buddhism very much on the decline in the beginning of the 8th century A. D. An attempt will be made here to discuss briefly the several causes that have been put forward by scholars for explaining the almost total disappearance of Buddhism from India. A few of the contributions bearing on this subject may be noted here. 'Religions of India' by A. Barth, translated by J. Wood (1882) pp. 133-139; Journal of Pali Texts Society (1896 pp. 87-92) on 'Persecution of Buddhists in India' by Rhys Davids; Kern's 'Manual of Buddhism' (in the German Grundriss pp. 133-134); 'Buddhist India' by Rhys Davids (1903, pp. 157-158, 319); I. H. Q. vol. IX pp. 361-371 (where the causes of the disappearance of Buddhism emphasized by M. M. Haraprasad Shastri are enumerated); 'The Sum of History' by René Grousset, translated by A. and H. Temple Patterson pp. 101-105 (Tower Bridge Publications, 1951); 'The Decline of Buddhism in India' by Dr. R. C. Mitra (1954), particularly pp. 125-164; 'Life and Teaching of Buddha' by Devamitta Dharmapala (G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras, 1938); '2500 years of Buddhism' edited by Prof. P. V. Bapat, 1956 pp. 360-376; 'The Path of the Buddha' by Prof. Kenneth W. Morgan pp. 47-50 (New York, 1956); 'How Buddhism left India' by N. J. O'Connor, Ralph Fletcher Seymour, Chicago (1957).

Before setting out the main causes of the virtual disappearance of Buddhism from India certain general points have to be emphasized. Buddha was only a great reformer of the Hindu religion as practised in his time. He did not feel or claim that he was forming a new religion, nor did he renounce the Hindu religion and all its practices and beliefs. The Buddha referred to the Vedas and Hindu sages with honour in some of his sermons. He recognised the importance of Yogic practices and meditation. His teaching took over several beliefs current among the Hindus in his day such as the doctrine of Karma and Rebirth and cosmological theories. A substantial portion of the teaching of Buddha formed part of the tenets of the Upaniṣadic period. At the time when he was born there were two main currents of thoughts and practices prevalent among the people, one being the path of sacrifices to Gods and the other being the path of moral endeavour, self-restraint and spiritual goal. It has been shown above (pp. 917–918) how the Upaniṣads assigned a lower position to the Vedas and the sacrifices enjoined therein and how spiritual knowledge after cultivating high ethical qualities was deemed greater than sacrifices. The Upaniṣads first began by symbolical interpretation of Vedic sacrifices, as for example in Bṛ. Up. I. 1. 1, where Uṣas, Sūrya and Saṁvatsara are said to be respectively the head, the eye and the soul of the sacrificial horse or as in Chān. Up II. 2. 1–2, where the five parts of the Sāman employed in a sacrifice are symbolically identified with earth, fire, sky, sun and heaven. Then they proceed to belittle the Veda as mere name and as much inferior to *brahmavidyā* (e. g. Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 21, I. 4.10, Chān. Up. VII. 1–4, Muṇḍaka I. 1. 4–5. It is generally held by all Sanskrit scholars that at least the oldest Upaniṣads like the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and the Chāndogya are earlier than Buddha, that they do not refer to Buddha or to his teachings or to the *piṭakas*. On the other hand, though in dozens of *Suttas* meetings of brāhmaṇas and Buddha or his disciples and missionaries are reported they almost always seem to be marked by courtesy on both sides. No meetings are recorded in the early Pali Texts or brahmanical Texts about Śākyans condemning the tenets of ancient brahmanism or about brāhmaṇas censuring the Bauddha heterodoxy. Besides, in all these meetings and talks, the central Upaniṣad conception of the immanence of *brahma* is never attacked by Buddha or by the early propagators of Buddhism. What Buddha says may be briefly rendered as follows: "Even so have I, O Bhikkhus, seen an ancient path, an ancient road followed by

rightly enlightened persons of former times. And what, O Bhikkhus, is that ancient path, that ancient road, followed by the rightly enlightened ones of former times? Just this very Noble Eightfold Path, viz. right views...&c. This, O Bhikkhus, is that ancient path, that ancient road, followed by the rightly enlightened ones of former times. Along that (path) I have gone and while going along that path, I have fully come to know, old age and death. Having come to know it fully, I have told it to the monks, the nuns, the lay followers, men and women; this *brahmacarya* is prosperous, flourishing, widespread, widely known, has become popular and made manifest well by gods and men."[1639] It will be noticed that the Noble Eightfold Path which the Buddha put forward as the one that would put an end to misery and suffering is here expressly stated to be an ancient path trod by ancient enlightened men. Buddha does not claim that he was unique, but claimed that he was only one of a series of Enlightened men and stressed that the moral qualities which he urged men to cultivate belonged to antiquity. In the Dhammapada and the Suttanipāta (Mahāvagga, Vāseṭṭha sutta) the truly virtuous man is spoken of as brāhmaṇa: "I speak of him as brāhmaṇa, who causes no harm (or evil) in body, word and thought, who is guarded as regards these three sources"; 'neither by matted hair nor by lineage, nor by caste, does one become a brāhmaṇa'; 'that man in whom there is truth and righteousness is blessed and is a brāhmaṇa'; 'him who does not cling to desires (or pleasures) as water does not stick to a lotus leaf or as a mustard grain (does not stick) on the top of an awl, I call a brāhmaṇa.'[1640] Moreover, it does not appear that at any time

---

1639. Vide संयुत्तनिकाय (P. T. S.), part II (Nidānavagga) edited by M. Leon Feer pp. 106–107 paragraphs 21–33, a few sentences from which may be quoted here: 'एवमेव ख्वाहं भिक्खवे अद्दसं पुराणं मग्गं पुराणंजसं पुब्बकेहि सम्मासंबुद्धेहि अनुयातं ॥ कतमो च सो भिक्खवे मग्गो पुराणंजसो...अनुयातो । अयमेव अट्ठंगिको मग्गो । सेय्यथापि सम्मादिट्ठि । ...अयं खो भिक्खवे पुराणमग्गो अनुयातो । तं अनुगच्छिं । तं अनुगच्छन्तो जरामरणं अभिञ्ञासिं । ...तद् अभिञ्ञाय आचिक्खिं भिक्खूनं भिक्खुनीनं उपासकानं उपासिकानं । तयिदं भिक्खवे ब्रह्मचरियं इद्धं चेव फीतं च वित्थारिकं बहुजञ्ञं पुथुभूतं याव देवमनुस्सेहि सुप्पकासितं ति ।'

1640. यस्स कायेन वाचाय मनसा नत्थि दुक्कतं । संवुतं तीहि ठानेहि तमहं ब्रूमि ब्राह्मणम् ॥ न जटाहि न गोत्तेन न जच्चा होति ब्राह्मणो । यम्हि सच्चं च धम्मो च सो सुखी सो च ब्राह्मणो ॥ वारि पोक्खरपत्तेव आरग्गेरिव सासपो । यो न लिम्पति कामेसु तमहं ब्रूमि ब्राह्मणम् ॥ धम्मपद verses 391, 393, 401 (of Dr. P. L. Vaidya's edition of 1934 in Devanāgarī type); सुत्तनिपात (महावग्ग, वासेट्ठसुत्त) has the last verse. With the verse 'na jaṭāhi

(*Continued on next page*)

the whole of India or even large portions of it were completely Buddhistic. The people of India as a whole were always Hindus.[1641]. There were many millions of people at all times who professed Hinduism and not Buddhism. Besides, even when Buddhism secured the patronage of emperors like Aśoka, Kaniṣka and Harṣa Buddhism was mainly restricted to monasteries and schools and great tolerance prevailed. For example, Harṣa's father was a great devotee of the Sun and he himself is described in his Banskhera and Madhuban plates as a great devotee of Śiva, though his elder brother Rājyavardhana is described as *paramasaugata* (a great devotee of Buddha) and he appears to have shown favour to the Buddhist pilgrim (Yuan Chwang).[1642]

Some recent authors like Prof. K. W. Morgan hold that the most important causes of the disappearance of Buddhism were decline of vigour in the Saṅgha, the Moslem invasions and the opposition of the Hindu community (' The Path of the Buddha' p. 48).

There is a good deal of truth in A. Coomaraswamy's contention that the more profound is one's study of Buddhism and Brahmanism the more difficult it becomes to distinguish between

---

(*Continued from last page*)

&c.' compare महाभारत, वनपर्व 216. 14-15 'यस्तु शूद्रो दमे सत्ये धर्मे च सततोत्थितः। तं ब्राह्मणमहं मन्ये वृत्तेन हि भवेद् द्विजः॥. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II p. 101 for other passages from the Great Epic similar to these. With the verse वारि पोष्करपत्रेषु &c. compare Chān. Up. IV. 14. 3 'यथा पुष्करपलाश आपो न श्लिष्यन्त एवमेवंविदि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यत इति' and Gītā V. 10 'लिप्यते न स पापेन पद्मपत्रमिवाम्भसा'.

1641. Vide for a similar view expressed by a great French *savant* and Sanskrit scholar Prof. L. Renou in 'Religions of ancient India' (University of London, 1953) p. 100.

1642. For Banskhera Plate of the year 22 (of the Harṣa era) i. e. 628-29 A. D., vide E. I. vol. IV pp. 210-211 and for the Madhuban plate of Harṣa in the year 25 i. e. 631-32 A. D., vide E. I. vol. I pp 72-73 (Bühler) and E. I. vol. VII pp. 157-158 (Kielhorn). Yuan Chwang does not mention that Rājyavardhana was a great devotee of Buddha but he tries to paint Harṣa as full of faith in Buddha from the beginning and narrates a fictitious story describing how Harṣa was prevented from mounting the throne and induced to take the title Kumāra by a Bodhisattva who miraculously appeared to him in return for his worship This shows that the accounts by the 'Master of the Law' must sometimes be taken with a pinch of salt. Vide Watters on 'Yuan Chwang's Travels in India' (London, 1904) vol. I p. 343 for this story.

the two or to say in what respects Buddhism is really unorthodox (vide his 'Hinduism and Buddhism' p. 452). Buddha and his successors really attacked some popular varieties of Brahmanism. Mrs. Rhys Davids in her lecture on 'The relations between Early Buddhism and Brahmanism' (published in I. H. Q. vol. X. pp. 274-286) endeavours to show that the Tripiṭakas do not refer to rupture with brāhmaṇas and that what Buddha preached was in agreement with the central tenet of immanence in the Brahmanism of the day. Buddha agreed (or at least had no quarrel) with the Upaniṣad teaching about high moral endeavour being a necessary pre-requisite for *brahma* realization and *mokṣa* (as in Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 23 'tasmād-evamvic-chānto dānta upratas-titikṣuḥ samāhito bhūtvā ātmanyevātmānam paśyati', Kaṭha Up. I. 2. 23, I. 3, 8, 9, 13, 15, Praśna Up. I. 15-16, Muṇḍaka I. 2. 12-13).

The main matters of controversy between Buddha and the Hindu religious and philosophical system current in his time are generally held to have been caste divisions and pride of caste, the absolute authoritativeness of the Vedas and the great importance attached to sacrifices.[1642a] Buddha asserted that righteousness and wisdom were the best, he did not expressly deny the existence of God but proclaimed that it was unnecessary to be definite nor did he pronounce his definite views on such questions as whether the world is eternal or non-eternal, since according to him, to cogitate on such points would be "a thicket of theorizing, wilderness of theorizing, the tangle of theorizing, the bondage and shackles of theorizing ...... nor would it conduce to aversion, passionlessness, tranquillity, peace, illumination and *nirvāṇa*."[1643] Buddha did not think much

---

1642 a. Barth in 'Religions of India' (pp. 125-126) scouts the theory that the institution of the Saṅgha and primitive Buddhism were a reaction against the regime of caste and the spiritual yoke of the brāhmaṇas and calls that theory 'a fiction of romance.'

1643. Vide Majjhima-nikāya (Cūla-Māluṅkyasutta and Aggi-vaccagotta-sutta) ed. by V. Trenkner, vol. I suttas 63 and 72 pp. 431 and 486 'न निब्बिदाय न विरागाय न निरोधाय न उपसमाय न अभिञ्ञाय न सम्बोधाय न निब्बानाय संवत्तति.' These very words occur in the Poṭṭhapada-sutta of the Dīgha-nikāya when Buddha was asked by Poṭṭhapada whether the world was permanent or otherwise, whether it was without end or not, whether the soul (jīva) and body were different and he replied that he did not expound these matters because they served no purpose and did not lead to nirvāṇa (Pali Texts Society, vol. I pp. 188-189 para 28).

of worship or prayer. According to him, what mattered was the deliverance of man from sorrow and suffering and the attainment of nirvāṇa[1643a] (which state he did not care to define clearly and precisely). The original doctrine (called *hīnayāna*, 'the lesser way or vehicle') held that the experience of enlightenment and *nirvāṇa* can be secured by human beings in this very life if they follow the path chalked out by Buddha.

The causes that have been advanced from time to time by scholars for the total disappearance of Buddhism from India must now be dealt with. (1) Persecution is alleged by some scholars as at least one of the main causes. King Puṣyamitra of the Suṅga dynasty is charged with having proclaimed that whoever would bring to him the head of a *śramaṇa* would receive one hundred *dīnāras*;[1644] Mihirakula, king of Kashmir,

---

1643 a. The word 'Nirvāṇa' literally means 'blown out, extinguished, or become cooled'. Taking the view most favourable to Buddha's teaching, it implies the blowing out or extinction of the fires of *kāma* (lust or desire), *krodha* (anger or ill-will), *moha* (ignorance or stupidity) and transformation of these into moral purity, goodwill (or charity) and wisdom. It is not like the Biblical Heaven. It is a state of perfect enlightenment, peace and bliss, attainable not merely after death, but in this very life and on this earth. It is really indescribable as stated in the Pali Udāna VIII 'unbecome, unborn, unformed &c.' and resembles the words used in speaking of *brahma* as 'neti neti' in Bṛ. Up. II. 3. 6, IV. 2. 4, IV. 4. 22, IV. 5. 15.

1644. The words in the Aśokāvadāna No. 29 (the Divyāvadāna ed. by Cowell and Neil, Cambridge, 1886, p. 434) 'यावत् पुष्यमित्रो यावत्सङ्घारामं भिक्षूंश्च प्रघातयन् प्रस्थितः । स यावच्छाकलमनुप्राप्तः । तेनाभिहितम् । यो मे श्रमणशिरो दास्यति तस्याहं दीनारशतं दास्यामि । ...यदा पुष्यमित्रो राजा प्रघातितस्तदा मौर्यवंशः समुच्छिन्नः ।'. Puṣyamitra is said by most authorities to be a Śuṅga and was called *senānī* in the Purāṇas, in Harṣacarita (VI) and in the Ayodhyā Inscription (in E. I. vol. 20 p. 54), while the above *avadāna* calls him Maurya. This shows either the ignorance of the writer of the Divyāvadāna (which is a late work) or the text itself may be incorrect or corrupt. Vide Pro. of the 6th Indian History Congress (Aligarh, 1943) pp. 109–116 where Mr. N. N. Ghosh propounds the theory that Puṣyamitra did persecute Buddhists, though his successors did not; on the other hand Dr. Ray Chaudhari in 'Political History of India' (5th ed.) does not agree to the theory of persecution by पुष्यमित्र. In the Āryamañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa (T. S. S. part III, 53rd chapter pp. 619–620) it is stated in a prophetic vein that a certain king called Gomimukhya (and also Gomiṣaṇḍa) extending his rule from East India to Kashmir will make Buddha's *śāsana* (system) disappear, will destroy *vihāras* and kill monks'. K. P. Jayaswal in 'Imperial History of India in a Sanskrit text' (p. 19) holds that Gomimukhya is a concealed name for

(Continued on next page)

is accused by Yuan Chwang (or more correctly, Hsuan Tsang according to some modern writers) with having overthrown Buddhist topes in Gandhāra, with destruction of monasteries and the slaughter of myriads of Buddhists (vide 'In the footsteps of Buddha' by René Grousset pp. 119–120 on Mihirakula, the Indian Attila); king Śaśāṅka is said by Yuan Chwang to have destroyed the Bo-tree (*Bodhidruma*), replaced the image of Buddha by one of Maheśvara and to have destroyed the religion of Buddha and dispersed the order (vide Beal's 'Buddhist Records of the Western World' Vol. II. pp. 118, 122 and Watters on 'Yuan Chwang's Travels' Vol. II, pp. 115–116); king Sudhanvan is supposed to have issued at the instigation of Kumārila[1644a] a proclamation to take effect from the Himālayas to Cape Comorin (which is palpably absurd) that he would put to death any servant of his who did not kill the Buddhists. These instances are carefully examined by no less a scholar than Rhys Davids in the Journal of the Pali Texts Society for 1896 (pp 87–92). After adverting to the facts that there is nothing about persecution in the Pali Piṭakas, that the tone of Pali books is throughout appreciative of brāhmaṇas, that no details are given and that hardly any names of persons suffering by

---

(*Continued from last page*)

Puṣyamitra, that the portion above quoted was written about 800 A. D. and was translated into Tibetan in 1060 A. D. (Intro. p. 3). Vide 'Puṣyamitra and the Śuṅga Empire' by Ramaprasad Chanda in I.H.Q. vol. V pp. 393–407 at p. 397 (for the concluding sentences of the Divyāvadāna in English) and pp. 587–613 and a recent paper on 'Puṣyamitra Śuṅga and Buddhists' by Hari Kishore Prasad in JBRS. vol. 40 pp. 29–38.

1644 a. Vide also 'Buddhist India' by Rhys Davids pp. 318–320 (5th ed. of 1917, the first being of 1903) about persecution and 'Life and Teaching of Buddha' by Devamitta Dharmapala p. 7 about Kumārila and Śaṅkara having waged only a polemic war and nothing more. The Tantravārtika of Kumārila also suggests that the Buddhists were afraid of polemic skirmishes with the Mīmāṅsakas and that, while stating in one breath that everything is momentary, the Buddhists at the same time foolishly boasted that their sacred texts also were eternal, borrowing that idea from the Vedic doctrines; यथा मीमांसकत्रस्ताः शाक्यवैशेषिकादयः । नित्य एवागमोऽस्माकमित्याहुः शून्यचेतनम् ॥ p. 235; तत्र शाक्यैः प्रसिद्धापि सर्वक्षणिकवादिता । त्यज्यते वेदसिद्धान्ताज्जल्पद्भिर्नित्यमागमम् ॥ p. 236. Vide note (2011) which will show that Kumārila was prepared to admit the usefulness of Buddha's teachings up to a certain point. Other literary works also show that it was a polemic war e. g. the वासवदत्ता *of* सुबन्धु (*not later than 6th century A. D.*) says 'केचिज्जैमिनिमतानुसारिण इव तथागतमतध्वंसिनः' (p. 144, Hall's ed.).

persecution are mentioned, he asserts that he does not believe in these stories, but adds that he does not go so far as to maintain that there is no truth at all in the legend about Puṣyamitra (but judgment must be reserved in view of the text in the *avadāna* being corrupt and the author of it being grossly ignorant). As to the legend about Sudhanvan and Kumārila he holds that of all the cases of alleged persecution this is the weakest and that it is no more than boastful and rhetorical exaggeration.[1645] Rhys Davids emphasizes that the adherents of both faiths so diametrically opposed to each other lived in continuous peace side by side for a thousand years, that this redounds to the credit of the whole Indian people from the time of Aśoka

---

1645. In the शङ्करदिग्विजय of माधवाचार्य it is stated (I. 56 and 59) that king Sudhanvan was an avatāra of Indra and Kumārila of Skanda (who is also known as Kumāra). The order of Sudhanvan is couched in that work as follows: व्यधादाज्ञां ततो राजा वधाय श्रुतिविद्विषाम्। आ सेतोरा तुषाराद्रेर्बौद्धानावृद्धबालकम्। न हन्ति यः स हन्तव्यो भृत्यानित्यन्वशान्नृपः॥ (शङ्करदिग्विजय I. 92-93). This seems to be a palpably absurd legend. No king in ancient India, much less one called Sudhanvā, ruled over the vast territory from the Himālayas to Rāmeśvara. Further, it may be noted that the order, supposing one was issued, was addressed only to the king's servants and not to one and all. The Śaṅkaradigvijaya (XV. 1) states that when Śaṅkarācārya started on a pilgrimage to Rāmeśvara king Sudhanvan accompanied him. Mādhavācārya, being blinded by his zeal to glorify his hero to the utmost, goes on heaping one legend on another and casts all history and chronology to the winds. For example, he narrates that Ācārya Abhinavagupta (a great Śaiva and Tāntrika teacher) was vanquished by Śaṅkara in disputations (XV. 158) and that Abhinavagupta practised black magic against the great Ācārya. From Abhinavagupta's own works it appears that his literary activity lay between 980 to 1020 A. D. (vide the author's 'History of Sanskrit Poetics', 1951, pp. 231-232), while no scholar would place Śaṅkarācārya later than 800 A. D. Mādhavācārya also says (XV. 157) that Śaṅkara vanquished by his arguments Śrīharṣa, author of Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya, who could not be vanquished by Guru, Bhaṭṭa and Udayana. Śrīharṣa flourished about the end of the 12th century A. D. Taranath in his 'History of Buddhism' says 'It was probably about this time that the terrible enemies of the Buddhists, Śaṅkarācārya and his disciple Bhaṭṭācārya appeared, the former in Bengal and the latter in Orissa. A short time after the Buddhists were persecuted in the South by Kumāralīla and Kaṇādaruru; here mention is made of the Buddhist king Śālivāhana, though the Buddhists relate that in the end Dharmakīrti triumphed in the discussion with Kumāralīla, Śaṅkarācārya or Bhaṭṭācārya &c. (I. A. vol. IV. p. 365). It will be noticed how the account is altogether confused. Vide Dr. Mitra's 'Decline of Buddhism' p. 129.

downwards and that India never indulged in persecution in anyway approaching to the persecution of reforming Christians by the orthodox Church or the persecution of Christians by the Roman authorities. Dr. R. C. Mitra in "Decline of Buddhism in India" (pp. 125–130) arrives at the same conclusion about the cases of persecution. Barth (in 'Religions of India' p. 136) admits that everything tends to prove that Buddhism became extinct from sheer exhaustion and that it is in its own inherent defects that we must seek for the causes of its disappearance. He prefaces this remark with the words 'the most reliable documents, coins and inscriptions, bear evidence of a tolerance exceptionally generous on the part of the civil powers' (p. 133) and illustrates this by examples.[1645a] It should be noted that great Smṛtikāras like Yājñavalkya laid down that when an Indian king reduced a kingdom to subjection, it was the conqueror's duty to honour the usages, the transactions and family traditions of the conquered country and to protect them. Aśoka, though himself a believer in Buddha's teachings, shows great

---

1645 a. यस्मिन्देशे य आचारो व्यवहारः कुलस्थितिः । तथैव परिपाल्योऽसौ यदा वशमुपागतः ॥. Nothing is gained by a total denial of even sporadic cases of religious persecution and vandalism. But such cases are very few and their very paucity emphasizes and illuminates the great religious tolerance of the Indian people for more than two thousand years. One interesting instance is found in an inscription from Ablur published in E. I. vol. V pp. 213 ff (at p. 243), where the story is told of an intense devotee of Śaivism named Ekāntada Rāma, who, in a controversy with the Jainas of Huligere (Lakṣmeśvara) led by a village headman named Saṅkagauḍā made a wager in a writing on palmyra leaf to the effect that he would cut his own head, place it at the feet of Somanātha in Huligere and have the head restored after seven days and that, if he succeeded, the Jains were to give up their faith and God. Ekāntada Rāma succeeded, but the Jainas refused to destroy the image of Jina, whereupon Rāma routed the horses and guards sent by the Jainas, laid waste the Jaina shrine and built a big Śiva shrine there. The Jainas complained to king Bijjala who sent for Rāma and questioned him. Rāma produced the writing containing the terms of the wager, but offered to perform the same feat. The Jainas were not prepared to face the same test again. Bijjala asked the Jainas to live peaceably with their neighbours, gave a *jayapatra* (document of Rāma's success) and granted a village to the temple of Somanātha. It is clear that a Jain image was overthrown and a Śaiva one was substituted by Rāma (leaving aside the superhuman feat ascribed to him). Rāma is to be placed shortly before 1162 A. D. There is a great difference between local brawls as in the above case and a general policy by a community or a king of wholesale persecution.

tolerance by requiring honour to be shown to all beliefs and sects in his 12th Rock Edict in the words 'Neither praising one's own sect nor blaming other sects should take place,' that 'other sects ought to be duly honoured in every case', that 'concord (samavāya) alone is meritorious, that is they should both hear and honour each other's Dhamma'.[1646] In the 7th Pillar Edict (Delhi-Topra p. 136) Aśoka proclaims that he appointed officers called Mahāmātras to look after the Saṅgha (the community or body of preaching Buddhist mendicants), brāhmaṇas, Ājīvikas, Nigganṭhas and all other *pāsaṇḍas* (sects). India has been for thousands of years a country of nearly absolute tolerance, which is literally a religion, while European religiosity has nearly always been intolerant and, when not intolerant, it is tantamount to mental hostility or complete indifference. Most Indian religious people were and are ready to agree that there may be alternative approaches to the mystery of life and the salvation of the soul. Indians feel amused at the claims of millions of people that some prophet revered by them has got the monopoly of the knowledge of God and the Hereafter. This tolerance for differing tenets and cults persisted in India with rare exceptions throughout the long stretch of time from centuries before Aśoka onwards till about 1200 A. D. when Moslems overran India. A few striking instances (both early and late) may be cited here: (1) Khāravela again, a Jain king of Kaliṅga (2nd or 1st century B. C.), granted freedom from taxation to brāhmaṇas in the 9th year of his reign (E. I. vol. XX. p. 79 and 88); (2) The Nasik cave Ins. No. 10 records that Uṣavadāta, son-in-law of Kṣatrapa Nahapāna of the Kṣaharāṭa lineage made very large gifts to gods and brāhmaṇas on the

---

1646. Vide 'Inscriptions of Aśoka' ed. by Dr. Hultzsch (1925) pp. 20-21 for the text and translation of the Rock Edict from Girnar. Dr. Minakshi in 'Administration and Social life under the Pallavas' (University of Madras, 1938, pp. 170-172) after remarking that Pallava monarchs as a class were tolerant towards all religious sects, points out that king Pallavamalla indulged in some harsh methods and persecution. Prof. Arnold Toynbee in 'East and West' (Oxford Uni. Press) points out that Christianity and Islam have seldom been content to follow the practice of 'live and let live' and that both of them have been responsible for some of the bitterest conflicts and cruellest atrocities that have disgraced history' (p. 49). Similarly, V. O. Vogt in 'Cult and Culture' condemns the unbending arrogance of Moslems and Christian Missionaries in their claims of revealed authority and laments that religion will meet disaster unless it universalizes its own conception of Revelation to embrace the future as well as the past (p. 70).

banks of sacred rivers and at Bharukaccha (modern Broach), Daśapura, Govardhana and donated a field for feeding a congregation of Buddhist monks (E. I. Vol. VIII p. 78); (3) The Gupta kings were generally devotees of Viṣṇu but they also made gifts to Buddhist monks e. g. Gupta Inscription No. 5 ('Gupta Inscriptions' ed. by Fleet pp. 31–34) records a grant by Āmrakārdava (an officer of Chandragupta II) to an Āryasaṅgha in the Gupta year 93 (412–3 A. D.); (4) Siri Chāntamūla I, an Ikṣvāku king of Śrīparvata in Āndhradeśa, had performed Agniṣṭoma, Vājapeya and Aśvamedha sacrifices but the ladies of that family were almost all Buddhist and one of them erected a pillar in honour of the supreme Buddha (E. I. Vol. XX. p. 8 and Jayaswal's 'History of India' 50–350 A. D., p 175); (5) The Maitraka rulers of Valabhī (in Kathiawar) were all orthodox Hindus and almost all are described as great devotees of Maheśvara (Śiva). The Journal of the University of Bombay vol III. (pp. 74–91) sets out five grants (four Buddhist and one to a brāhmaṇa) The first is issued by a feudatory Gārulaka Mahārāja Varāhadāsa in Valabhī year 230 (= 549 A.D.) and the others by the Valabhī kings themselves. The four Buddhist records make grants to Yakṣaśūra-vihāra and Pūrṇabhaṭṭa-vihāra (both monasteries for nuns) of lands and villages for providing garments, food, beds, seats and medicines to the nuns and for providing for incense, flowers, sandalwood &c. for the worship of Buddha images; (6) A king of Orissa, named Śubhākaradeva, who was son of a Buddhist king and who styles himself *paramasaugata*, made a grant of two villages in the latter half of the 8th century to a hundred brāhmaṇas belonging to various gotras (E. I. vol. 15 at pp. 3–5 Neulpur grant); (7) Vigrahapāla, king of Bengal, who belonged to the Buddhist Pāla dynasty, granted in the 12th year of his reign a village to a Sāmavedi brāhmaṇa after taking a bath in the Ganges on a lunar eclipse in honour of Buddha (Bhagavantam Buddhabhaṭṭārakam uddiśya) by the Amgacchi grant (E. I. Vol. XV. p. 293 at pp. 295–298, about 1000 A. D.); (8) The successor of king Vigrahapāla (iii) by name Mahīpāla granted a village in honour of Buddha after a bath in the Ganges in Viṣuva-saṅkrānti to a brāhmaṇa (E. I. Vol. XIV. p. 324); vide also I. A. vol. 21 pp. 253–258 for a grant of Devapāladeva, a Buddhist king of Bengal, about the end of the 9th century, recording a grant of a village to a learned brāhmaṇa. (9) In the Kalacuri stone Inscription from Kasia (E. I. vol. XVIII p. 128) the first invocation in prose is to Rudra and then to Buddha, the first two

verses are in praise of Śaṅkara, 3rd in praise of Tārā (a Buddhist deity) and the 4th and 5th verses praise Buddha (who is styled Munīndra); (10) Kumāradevī, 4th queen of Govindacandra (1114–1154 A. D.), a Gāhaḍavala king of Kanauj and an orthodox Hindu, built a *vihāra* in which she placed an image of Dharma-cakra Jina i. e. Buddha (vide E. I. Vol. IX p. 319 at p. 324); (11) Govindacandra himself made a gift of six villages to a Buddhist learned ascetic (Śākyarakṣita by name) who hailed from Utkala (Orissa) and to his pupil for the benefit of the Saṅgha at Jetavana Mahāvihāra (vide the Sahet-Mahet plate of Govindacandra dated *saṁvat* 1186, i. e. 1128–29 A. D. recorded in E. I. vol. XI p. 20 at p. 24). (12) The Madanapur plate of the Buddhist king Śrīcandra[1647] of East Bengal records that the king made a grant of land to a brāhmaṇa named Śukradeva 'in honour of Buddha-bhaṭṭāraka' after having bathed on the Agastitṛtīyā day. (13) The Dambal (inscription of the times of Cālukya Tribhuvanamalla alias Vikramāditya (in śaka 1017 i. e. 1095–96 A. D.) begins with an invocation to Buddha and records certain grants to two vihāras, one of Buddha built by certain Seṭṭis of Dharmāpura or Dharmavoḷal (i. e. Dambal in Dharwar District) and the other of Tārādevī by a Seṭṭi of Lokkiguṇḍi (or modern Lakkuṇḍi). (14) In E. I. vol. XVI p. 48 at p. 51 (Inscription of Lakṣmeśvara in 1147 A. D.) a general is styled as the restorer of the four sects viz. Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava, Bauddha and Jaina (catuḥ-samaya-samuddharaṇam). (15) A stone inscription from Śrāvastī (modern Sahet-Mahet) of (Vikrama) saṁvat 1276 (1219–20 A. D.) records that a certain person Vidyādhara of the Vāstavya family established a convent for Buddhist ascetics at the town where the inscription was put up (I. A. Vol. 17 p. 61). (16) The Kumbhakoṇam Inscription of Sevappa Nāyaka of Tanjore (of 1580 A. D.) records the gift of some land in the brāhmaṇa village (*agrahāra*) of Tirumaliarājapuram to an individual attached to a temple of Buddha at Tiruvilandura.[1648]

1647. There is divergence of views about the date of Śrīcandra. Vide Dr. R. C. Majmudar's 'History of Bengal', vol. I p. 196 (where the beginning of 11th century A. D. has been accepted by some scholars as the date of Śrīcandra).

1648. The last two examples indicate that, though Jayacandra of Kanauj was defeated and Kanauj was taken by the Mahomedans in 1193 A. D., Buddhism had not become totally extinct in North India in the first quarter of the 13th century A. D. and that some remnants of Buddhism existed in South India up to the 16th century A. D.

The above examples show that in all parts of India in the North as well as in the South, the general rule among kings and their officers was tolerance and care for all faiths. If there was rarely some persecution it was by an individual king or officer or the like. On the other hand, though Aśoka, as an inheritor of the Indian royal tradition of showing honour and respect to all faiths of the subjects irrespective of his own religious views, breathes a striking spirit of tolerance in his 7th and 12th Rock edicts, one cannot help a suspicion that in the later part of his life he seems to gloat over the fact that the gods worshipped as divinities in Jambudvīpa had been rendered false and he proudly proclaims that this result is 'not the effect of my greatness but of my zeal'.

It should be noted that even Aśoka's ahimsā was at first not thorough-going but qualified. In his first Rock Edict he himself states that in his royal kitchen thousands of animals were killed, but that he had reduced the slaughter to two peacocks a day and one deer (that too rarely) and that even the three animals would not be killed in future (vide C. I. I. vol. I. pp 1–2). Whether this last promise was really carried out is not clear. Besides, Aśoka appears to have carried his solicitude for the protection of all life too far and used against human beings his absolute power like a dictator. In the 4th Delhi Topra Pillar edict (C. I. I., vol. I p. 124) he mentions that his revenue settlement officers called Lajūkas had to deal with many hundred thousands of men and were given the discretion to award punishments including the *death sentence* and that a respite of three days was allowed in which the relatives of the man condemned to death could persuade the lajūkas to grant reprieves. In the fifth Delhi-Topra pillar edict (*ibid.* pp 125–128), after 26 years of his being anointed he declared that 23 kinds of birds and other animals (such as parrots, *mainas*, ruddy and wild geese, doves, certain kinds of fish, tortoises) were not to be killed at all, that ewes and sows that were with young or were in milk or the young of these that were less than six months old were also not to be killed; he also forbade the sale of fish on certain Full Moon days and the days previous to them and following them, the castration of bulls, rams, horses on 8th, 14th and 15th days of a month and the branding of horses and bulls on Puṣya and Punarvasu and on cāturmāsīs. These sweeping regulations must have caused great hardships to poor people and must have assumed the form of rigid coercion more or less, particularly

when all discretion was left to the lajūkas. Later in life Aśoka appears to have tried to undermine the worship of Hindu Gods. In a Rupnath Rock Inscription[1649] published by Bühler in I. A. vol. VI pp. 154–156 it was stated that he had been an *upāsaka* (lay worshipper of Buddha) for certain years but that he was not zealous, that for a year or more (he had become zealous), that during that (last interval) those gods that were held to be true gods in Jambudvīpa (i. e. India) had been made (to be regarded as) false and that was the reward of his zeal. This could be construed as saying that when he became a zealous Buddhist he tried to dissuade people from the

1649. The important words in the Rock edict at Brahmagiri, Rūpanāth and six other places are quoted here (there are slight variations and some omissions in almost all of them here and there); I follow the reading in the Rūpanath text given by Prof. Jules Bloch in 'Les Inscriptions d' Aśoka' (Paris, 1950 pp. 145–148) 'देवानं पिये हेवमाह · सातिरेकानि अढ़तियानि व (स्सानि / य सुमि पाकासके (उपासके?) नो चु बाढि पक्कते (पक्रन्ते) · सातिलेके चु छवच्छरे य सुमि हकं संघ (संघे) उपेते बाढि च पक्रन्ते · या इमाय कालाय जम्बुदिपस्सि अमिस्सा देवा हुसु ते दानि मिस्सा कटा · पक्रमस्स हि एस फले · नो च एसा महत्तता पाप्पोत्तवे · खुदकेन पि पक्रमिनेन सकिये पिपुले पि स्वगे आरोढवे · (the rest is omitted). The Erragudi copy of the edict reads 'इमिना चु कालेन अमिस्सा सुनिस्सा देवेहि ते दानि मिस्सिभूता'. Two others from near by regions read इमिना चु कालेन अमिस्सा समाना सुनिस्सा जम्बुदीपस्सि मिस्सा देवेहि · There are some gaps and mistakes in these and it is not clear what is meant. Probably the sentence in these latter may be rendered 'During that time men that were true (or, if we take *amissā* as equal to amiśrā 'that were not mixed with gods') became false (or, became mixed with gods'). The words from पक्रमस्स onwards mean 'this is the result of zeal; it cannot be attained by greatness (by one occupying a merely high position); even for a small person it is possible to reach heaven by zeal.' Mr. Ramchandra Dikshitar in Prof. Rangaswami Aiyangar Presentation volume pp. 25–30 argues that Aśoka was a Hindu as he refers to 'Svarga'. This is not correct, since the edict itself recites that Aśoka had been a lay follower of Buddha for more than 2½ years before the date of the edict and that for more than a year before it he approached the community of monks and became a zealous Buddhist (or probably a monk). Even early Pali works speak of Gods from heaven coming to pay respect to Buddha. So the mere mention of *svarga* means little. Aśoka does not appear to have been trained in the sacred Pali books if any existed. He hardly ever mentions nirvāṇa, never mentions fundamental tenets of early Buddhism (in all his numerous edicts) like the Four Noble Truths or the Noble Eight-fold Path or Pratītya-samutpāda. He was probably attracted by Buddha's teachings on moral endeavour and subscribed to them and disliked sacrifices. He appears to have believed in gods and desired that the people should strive for heaven (vide 6th Rock edict at Girnar 'परत्र च स्वगं आराधयन्तु' and similar words in the 10th Rock edict). This is all that can be said positively.

worship of gods and probably resorted to coercive measures in that direction. This very inscription is edited at C. I. I., Vol. I. pp. 166 by Dr. Hultzsch and the translation of the important sentence is changed and is given as 'And those gods who during that time had been unmingled with men in Jambudvīpa have now been made (by me) mingled with them; for this is the fruit of zeal'. This new translation cannot be understood as it stands and on p. 168 (note 3) Hultzsch admits that this sentence is enigmatical and tries to show that it refers to religious shows at which effigies of gods were shown in order to convey to the subjects that they would be able to reach the abodes of gods by the zealous practice of Buddha's Dhamma. This interpretation is extremely far-fetched and does not fit into the context. How can the mere showing of exhibitions and their effect on people be regarded as the reward of zeal? Besides, in the very first rock edict he forbids assemblies or festival meetings (C. I. I. vol. I. p. 1 'na ca samājo kattavyo)' except such as were regarded good by Aśoka and asserts that the king sees great evil in festival meetings. Aśoka probably followed what Āp. Dh. S. I. 11. 32. 19 provides for Vedic householders 'sabhāḥ samājāṁśca' (varjayet), sabhā meaning 'gambling hall'. The author is not satisfied with the translation of Hultzsch, particularly when Bühler and Senart (pp. 168 note) agreed as to the meaning of the important sentence about gods.[1650]

About Emperor Harṣa also Yuan Chwang narrates that he caused the use of animal food to cease throughout the five Indies and he prohibited the taking of life under severe penalties (vide Watters' work cited above p. 344). This also must have been felt by large populations as coercive and bordering on persecution. It is remarkable that Harṣa felt no qualms in reconciling his zeal for bird and animal life and keeping vast armies on a war footing for conquest.

1650. Hultzsch himself in JRAS for 1910 at p. 1310 translated 'those who at that time were (considered by me) the true gods of Jambudvīpa are now considered false (by me)'. The Mysore texts of this edict insert 'men' after the word 'those'. The great difficulty is about the words 'amissā' and 'missā kaṭā'. They may respectively stand for 'amṛṣā' (not false) or 'amiśrā' (not mixed) and 'mṛṣā kṛtā' (made false) or miśrā kṛtā (made mixed). There is no word for 'considered'. A straightforward translation of 'amissā devā husu' would be 'that were the true (not false) gods' and of 'missā katā' would be 'were made false'.

A few more striking examples of tolerance of other faiths and spirit of accommodation may be cited here. The great Hindu emperor Samudragupta allowed the building of a splendid three-storied convent at Bodh Gaya at the request of the Buddhist king Meghavarṇa of Ceylon about 360 A. D. Vide 'Early History of India' by V. A. Smith (4th ed. of 1924 pp. 303-304), where the historian further points out that when Yuan Chwang visited Bodh Gaya, that convent was a magnificent establishment occupied by a thousand monks. One Muhammad Ufi relates an anecdote. Though Mahomed of Gazni plundered Kathiawad and Gujarat several times and desecrated temples, the Hindus made a distinction between such invading and destructive marauders and peaceful Muslims residing in Gujarat for trade. Some Hindus at Cambay, being incited by some Parsis, destroyed a mosque and killed some Muslims. One Muslim that escaped approached the king Siddharāja with a petition. The king in disguise inquired into the matter, punished the offenders, gave to the Moslems one *lakh* of *Balotras* to rebuild the mosque and presented to the Khatib four articles of dress which were preserved in the mosque. Ufi declares that he never heard a story comparable to this. Vide Elliotts' History of India, Vol. II pp. 162-163. The Somanath-Paṭṭan Inscription (in I. A. Vol. XI p. 241) is a most remarkable document. A Muslim ship-owner from Hormuz acquired a piece of land in the sacred town of Somanath-paṭṭan, built a mosque, a house and shops thereon. The purpose of the grant was to confirm the purchase and to provide for the application of the income from the shops for particular Moslem religious festivals to be celebrated by the Shia sailors of Somanath and to provide that the surplus left, if any, was to be made over to the sacred towns of *Mecca and Medina*. It is dated in four eras, first in Rasul Mahammad *saṁvat* i. e. Hijra year 662, then Vikrama *saṁvat* 1320 (1264 A. D.), Valabhī year 945 and Siṁha saṁvat 151 (i. e. probably of Cālukya Siddharāja Jayasiṁha). Syrian Christians were given special privileges by generous Hindu rulers in South India.

The above examples will indicate what tolerance was practised by Indian kings and people even in the mediaeval period when Moslem invaders were ruthlessly attacking India. The reader should visualise to himself what the fate of a Hindu would have been, if he had the audacity to build a temple in Christian or Moslem countries or tried to collect materials for

describing the Christian or Muslim religion and ways of life in the 13th century A. D. like Alberuni, who was able to collect, without molestation, from Hindu Pandits and people vast material in the 11th century A. D.

How intolerant most Moslem kings were need not be dwelt upon at length. A few typical examples may be cited from the Cambridge History of India, vol. III. Firuz Shah Tughlak burnt a brāhmaṇa who tried to propagate his religion (*ibid.* p. 187); Sikander Lodi did the same (*ibid.* p. 246) to a brāhmaṇa and was guilty of wholesale destruction of Hindu temples; Sultan Sikandar of Kashmir offered his subjects the choice between Islam and exile (*ibid* p. 280); Hussein Shah of Bengal sent an army to destroy Navadvīpa and converted many brāhmaṇas forcibly. Jehangir says in his 'Memoirs' (translated by A. Rogers and edited by H. Beveridge, 1909 pp. 72–73) that he killed Guru Arjun for his religious activities. Vide 'History of Aurangzeb' by Jadunath Sarkar vol. III. chap. XXX. pp. 265–279 for *firmans* to demolish temples such as those of Somanātha, Mathurā, Viśvanātha in Benares, Ujjain and Appendix V. It is not necessary to go into great details about the terrible persecution of the Jews in Europe and the horrible deeds of the Inquisition in Europe and particularly in Spain and Portugal. For the persecution and expulsion of the Jews in Europe one may read 'A short History of the Jewish people' by Cecil Roth (MacMillan and Co. 1936) chapters XX–XXI. References to several works have been given above on p. 933 note 1494 about the Inquisition. A few instances of the intolerance and barbarities of that body may be cited. The Inquisition staged what are called acts of faith or 'autos-da-fé'. In the presence of thousands of people severe punishment would be inflicted on harmless individuals whose adherence to the Holy Catholic faith was suspected. Those that professed penitence were stripped of their property and condemned to imprisonment, deportation or the galley. The minority who refused to confess to their crime of heresy or gloried in their views would be burnt at once. Kings and nobles graced such spectacles by their presence and such spectacles were arranged at the marriages of high persons or on the birth of a son to the reigning monarch. During the three centuries when the Inquisition was active, *it is found* that the it condemned about 375000 people, of whom at least one-tenth were burnt; vide Cecil Roth's 'A short History of the Jewish people' (1936) p. 312. Henry C. Lea in 'Superstition and

force' (1878) pp. 426-427 remarks 'The whole system of the Inquisition was such as to render resort to torture inevitable. Its proceedings were secret; the prisoner was carefully kept in ignorance of the exact charges against him and of the evidence on which they were based. He was presumed to be guilty and his judges bent all their energies to force him to confess. To accomplish this no means were too base or too cruel'.

It would be instructive to read what the state of Hindus was under Portuguese rule in Goa, where the infamous Inquisition was established in 1560 A. D. and continued its intolerant and inhuman work for about 250 years more. Those interested may consult 'A India Portuguesa', vol. II. published by the Portuguese Government in 1923, particularly the paper by Antonio de Noronha, a former judge of the High Court of Goa, on 'Os Indus de Goa' pp. 211–355. A brief passage from a paper on 'Historical essay on the Konkani Language' by J. H. de Cunha Rivara, who was General Secretary to the Portuguese Governor General in India from 1855 to 1870 A. D., is very illuminating. It runs (original in Portuguese) 'we shall now endeavour to investigate the causes, which under the Portuguese regime, were either favourable or contrary to the culture of the Konkani language. In the first ardour of conquest temples were demolished, all the emblems of the Hindu cult were destroyed and books written in the vernacular tongue, containing or suspected of containing idolatrous precepts and doctrines, were burnt. There was even the desire to exterminate all that part of the population which could not be quickly converted; this was the desire not only during that period, but there was also at least one person who, after a lapse of two centuries, advised the Government, with magisterial gravity, to make use of such a policy.' The writer further notes that the long distance of Goa from Portugal, the invincible resistance offered by a numerous population amongst whom the principal castes had reached a very high degree of civilization, obliged the conquerors to abstain from open violence and to prefer indirect, though not gentle, means to achieve the same end.[1650a].

Buddha's renunciation of his princely position, of his young wife, child and home, to become a wandering ascetic for discovering the path of humanity's deliverance from sorrow and

1650a. Quoted from p. 161 of 'The Printing Press in India' by Prof. A. K. Priolkar (Bombay, 1958).

suffering, his subsequent mortification of the body for years, his retirement into solitude for meditation, his struggle with Māra and final victory, his confidence that he had discovered the path of deliverance, his constant travels from city to city and village to village for about forty-five years for preaching the great truths he had discovered, his crusade against the slaughter of innocent and dumb animals in sacrifices, his passing away full of years and in peace and contentment – this panorama of Buddha's life had a noble grandeur and irresistible human appeal. Edwin Arnold in his preface (p. XIII) to his poem 'Light of Asia' (1884) pays a very eloquent tribute to Buddha's teaching in the following words 'this venerable religion which has in it the eternity of an universal hope, the immortality of a boundless love, an indestructible element of faith in the final good and the proudest assertion ever made of human freedom'. The torch lighted by Buddha was kept burning brightly by a succession of able and worthy disciples till Buddhism reached its peak about the 6th century A. D. A reaction had already begun by that time. Substantial changes in the old Buddhist faith had been made, the ideals had changed (as noted above). From being a faith without a clear acceptance of God, many sects arose that had become thoroughly theistic and Buddha himself came to be worshipped as if he were God and the sects were gripped by the strange doctrines and evil practices of Vajrayāna Tāntrik sects; and Buddhism became a medley of conflicting dogmas and was riven with dissensions and internecine rupture. Discussions as to doctrines arose immediately on the passing away of Buddha, when the first council was held at Rājagṛha, a second one being held about one hundred years later at Vesāli and a third one at Pāṭaliputra under Aśoka. In all four councils appear to have been held to secure 'saṅgīti' (standardized scriptural recital) according to traditions, but no Pali book can be traced back to a time before the council held in the time of Aśoka (about 250 B. C.). These discussions and subsequent schisms very much undermined Buddhism. This is mentioned as the first of the four main causes of the decline and disappearance of Buddhism from India by N. J. O'Connor.

III. From about the end of the 7th century A. D. India was divided into several independent but small and warring States. Buddhism could not secure the favour and patronage of powerful and zealous monarchs and emperors like Aśoka, Kaniṣka and

Harṣa. Royal patronage on a large scale having ceased from the end of the 7th century A. D., except under the Pāla kings of Bengal, Buddhism began to wane.

IV. Many of the ablest and most vigorous exponents of Buddhist thought and faith left India for propagating their faith in other lands. Dr. Radhakrishnan in 'India and China' names 24 eminent Indian scholars who went to China for propagating Buddha's teachings from the 3rd Century A. D. to 973 A. D. (p. 27) and also mentions a few Chinese scholars who came to India for visiting the sacred places of Buddhism and for making a study of Buddhism on the spot (*ibid.* pp. 27-28).

V. The observance of the high moral ideals inculcated by Gotama Buddha must have been found irksome by at least a great many of his followers, and particularly after his personal example ceased to exist. In the Mahāparinibbānasutta (S. B. E. vol. XI. p. 127) we are told that Subhadda, a barber who had been received in the Order in his old age, addressed the brethren, that deeply mourned and lamented on Buddha's nirvāṇa, as follows: "Weep not, neither lament. We are well rid of the *Great Samana*. We used to be annoyed by being told 'this becomes you, this beseems you not'. But now we shall be able to do whatever we like; and what we do not like that we shall not have to do." Ordinary people could not be fed for long on mere repetition of the sermon on suffering being the lot of man, on monasticism, aversion to speculation and on promises of nirvāṇa which was hardly ever well defined. By nirvāṇa Buddha probably meant extinction of egoism and desires, a state of bliss beyond understanding and not a complete annihilation or extinction. But this last was the sense in which many understood it. Buddha had an aversion to speculation and particularly to issues that were irrelevant to his purely moral approach and purpose. Several questions of a metaphysical or speculative character such as whether the world is permanent or not, whether it is finite or not, whether the soul is the same as the body or other than the body, whether the Tathāgata continues after death or not were left unanswered by Buddha (vide Majjhima Nikāya discourse 63, Trenckner's ed. vol. I.). Monastaries of Buddhist monks and nuns became in course of time centres of idleness, pleasures and immorality, and of debased practices like those of Vajrayāna Tāntricism. A well-known scholar like Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, himself a Buddhist bhikṣu, in a paper on 'Vajrayāna and the 84 Siddhas' contributed to the

Journal Asiatique vol. 225 (1934) pp. 209–230 was constrained to say "The monasteries and temples were gorged with riches due to the pious offerings made by the multitudes. The life of the monk became more comfortable than that of the layman. The discipline weakened and many unfit persons entered the community.[1651] The easy life associated with the culture of a sensual art under the cover of cultured paintings, meditation, gods and goddesses must have inclined the minds towards sensuality. Already from the Kathāvatthu[1651a] (XXIII. 1) we know that the Andhaka School was disposed to permit *Maithuna* (copulation) for a special object; it was introduced in the mystic cult. Coming to the south, the practice of mantras, psychical practices, and a certain indulgence in the pleasures of sense were united; the Vajrayāna was complete".

VI. Smṛtis like those of Gautama (IX. 47, 68, 73), Manu (IV. 176, 206, X. 63), Yājñavalkya (I. 156, III. 312–313), while asking the people to honour the Vedas and learned brāhmaṇas laid great emphasis[1652] on *Ahiṁsā*, truthfulness, charity, self-

---

1651. A paper of Dr. A. S. Altekar in the Pro. of the 17th All India Oriental Conference at Ahmedabad, 1953 (pp. 243–246) on Śramanera-Ṭīkā (about 11th century A. D.) on the Ācārasāra (laying down rules for Buddhist novices) enumerates admonitions (some of the striking ones being set out on p. 245) that lead to the conclusion that the monks had a fairly large number among them that brought Buddhism into disrepute. In the 'Questions of king Milinda' S. B. E. vol. 35 pp. 49–50, to the question why people joined the *saṅgha*, Nāgasena gives the significant answer that some joined the saṅgha for the reason that sorrow may perish and no further sorrow may arise, 'the complete passing away without clinging to the world is our heighest aim'; "'some have left the world in terror at the tyranny of kings; some have joined to be safe from being robbed, some harassed by debts and some perhaps to gain a livelihood.

1651 a. एकाधिप्पायो मेथुनो धम्मो पटिसेवित्तब्बो ति। आमन्ता। कथावत्थु XXIII, 1.

1652. अहिंसा सत्यमस्तेयं शौचमिन्द्रियनिग्रहः। एतं सामासिकं धर्मं चातुर्वर्ण्येऽब्रवीन्मनुः॥ मनु X. 63; अहिंसा सत्यमस्तेयं शौचमिन्द्रियनिग्रहः। दानं दमो दया क्षान्तिः सर्वेषां धर्मसाधनम्॥ या. I. 22; अथाष्टावात्मगुणाः। दया सर्वभूतेषु क्षान्तिरनसूया शौचमनायासो मङ्गलमकार्पण्यमस्पृहेति। यस्यैते चत्वारिंशत्संस्कारा न चाष्टावात्मगुणा न स ब्रह्मणः सायुज्यं सालोक्यं गच्छति। गौतमधर्मसूत्र VIII 23–25. The मत्स्यपुराण (52. 8–10) mentions these very eight as 'ātmaguṇas' after referring to the Veda and ācāra 'वेदोऽखिलो धर्ममूलमाचारश्चैव तद्विदाम्। अष्टावात्मगुणास्तस्मिन्प्रधानत्वेन संस्थिताः॥' मत्स्य 52. 7–8; the Atrismṛti (verses 34–41) mentions almost all these eight and defines them and Haradattā on Gautama quotes eight verses defining these eight *guṇas*. धम्मपद verse 131 is 'सुखकामानि भूतानि यो दण्डेन विहिंसति। अत्तनो सुखमेसानो पेच्च सो न लभते सुखम्॥'

restraint, sexual purity and other virtues for persons of all the four varṇas, just as Buddha and early Buddhist works did for his followers. The sentiment in Manu V. 45 and the Viṣṇu-dharmasūtra 51. 68 'he, who kills harmless animals (like deer) merely for the sake of his own pleasure, never increases nor prospers in happiness, whether living or after death,' finds a parallel in Dhammapada 131. Even the Ṛgveda solemnly says (X. 85. 1) 'the earth is supported by Truth, the sky is supported by the Sun'. The Muṇḍaka Up. exhorts 'Truth alone is victorious, not falsehood' (III. 1. 6).

VII. The strong faith and the alertness of brāhmaṇas who welded into a coherent whole the Veda, the philosophy of the Upaniṣads, Yogic practices of a middle path as in Gītā VI. 15-17, the doctrine of salvation by faith and bhakti for all preached in the Gītā gradually held an irresistible appeal.

VIII. In re-orienting their religious outlook and practices to stem the tide of Buddhism and make Hinduism popular, the brāhmaṇas and other leaders of Hindu society of the centuries before and after the Christian era had to make compromises of a far-reaching character; the old Vedic gods (like Indra and Varuṇa) receded into the background though not totally forgotten, most of the Vedic sacrifices had to be given up, deities like Devī, Gaṇeśa and the Mātṛs had to be brought to the front, Paurāṇika mantras came to be used along with Vedic ones as the mantras even in śrāddha (e. g. 'dātāro nobhivardhantām' &c. which occurs in Manu III. 259, Yāj. I. 246, Matsya 16. 49-50, Padma, Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa 9. 117, Kūrma II. 22. 60 and other works). Even an early writer like Varāhamihira (first half of 6th century A.D.) in describing the Puṣya-snāna for the king provides ordinary mantras (Bṛ. S. 47. 55-70) to be recited by the *purohita* along with mantras in the Atharvaveda, Rudra (Tai. S. IV. 5. 1-11), the Kūṣmāṇḍa mantras (Vāj. S. XX. 14-16 and others, Bṛ. S. 47. 71) and winds up the whole procedure with a well-known Paurāṇika verse.[1653] Even Aparārka (pp. 14-15) had to say that in Devapūjā the procedure to be followed is that in the Narasiṁhapurāṇa (probably something like the one in chap. 2 of the Narasiṁha Purāṇa) and in the matter of 'pratiṣṭhā' (establishment of images) also Paurāṇika procedure was to be adopted. Besides, emphasis was laid on ahiṁsā, charity (dāna),

1653. यान्तु देवगणाः सर्वे पूजामादाय पार्थिवात्। सिद्धिं दत्त्वा तु विपुलां पुनरागमनाय च॥ बृहत्सं. 47. 49.

pilgrimages and vratas and it was said that the latter two were more efficacious than even Vedic sacrifices. These changes seriously reduced the appeal of Buddhism. The purāṇas contained stories of gods and avatāras that vied in their appeal to the common man with the Buddhist Jātaka tales. The Kādambarī of Bāṇa (first half of 7th century A. D.) states that the people of Ujjayinī were fond of the Mahābhārata, Purāṇas and Rāmāyaṇa (Mahābhārata–Purāṇa–Rāmāyaṇā–nurāgiṇā &c). This is put down as the last of the four causes of the decline of Buddhism by O'Connor.

IX. From about the 7th century A. D. Buddha began to be recognised by Hindus as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu and by the 10th century Buddha came to be so recognised throughout India by almost all Hindus.

X. Moslem fanaticism and invasions of India delivered the *coup de grace* (final blow) to Buddhism about and after 1200 A. D. by ruining famous universities like those of Nālandā and Vikramaśilā and the monks were mercilessly killed in large numbers. Those who escaped the carnage fled to Tibet and Nepal. H. M. Elliott's History of India (as told by its own historians) vol. II p. 306 contains a passage from Tabakat–i–Nasiri about Bakhtiyar Khilji that states that Bakhtiyar led his army to Behar and ravaged it, that great plunder fell in his hands, that most of the inhabitants of the place were brāhmaṇas with shaven heads, that they were put to death, that large numbers of books were found and it was discovered that the whole fort and city was a place of study (*madrasa*). The description indicates that brāhmaṇa with shaven heads were Buddhist monks.

It should not be supposed that Buddhist bhikkhus renounced wealth altogether. Vide I. A. vol. VII pp. 254–256 (Inscriptions 2 and 9 at Kuda) where bhikṣus and bhikṣuṇīs are donors and Cunningam's ' Bhilsa Topes ' p. 235–236 where there are many bhikṣus and some bhikṣuṇīs among donors. The great appeal of the original Buddhism to common men lay in its spirit of self-abnegation, discipline, service and sacrifice.

When Moslem invaders exterminated the monks the laity became bewildered and were either converted to Islam or became slowly absorbed among Hindus. It has been already stated that Buddha himself was against the admission of women into the Saṅgha but at the persistent requests of his favourite pupil

Ānanda he yielded and prophesied that his pure Dharma, which otherwise would have flourished for a thousand years, would not last so long but only for 500 years. Vide 'Cullavagga' in SBE. vol. XX p. 325.

The Pātimokkha for monks contains 227 articles which were to be recited twice a month in an assembly of at least four monks and confessions of breaches of the rules had to be made. If one reads the Cullavagga (SBE. XX. pp 330-340), one may understand how the gatherings of legions of monks and nuns in immense monasteries led in some cases to sapping the ordinary observances of decency and morality. At first the Pātimokkha could be recited to nuns by monks and the nuns could confess their lapses to monks but this had to be changed later and it was laid down that only bhikkhuṇīs could do these things for them. P. 333 of the same shows how nuns quarrelled among themselves and came to blows and p. 335 narrates how some monks threw dirty water on nuns and how they uncovered their bodies and thighs before nuns.

The author has cited the above as the main causes of the disappearance of Buddhism following what most have written. Different writers attach importance to a few of them according to their individual leanings. While prepared to concede that the causes noted above went a long way in bringing about the downfall of Buddhism in India, he feels that the principal cause was that large sections of the Indian population came to realize that the persistent teaching of the world being a place of suffering, of giving up all desires and of monasticism, which were preached by the writers on Buddhism to all and sundry, was too much for ordinary men to attempt and that the Hindu ideal of an ordered scheme of life into four *āśramas*,[1654] with peculiar duties and rights, particularly the importance attached to the gṛhasthāśrama showed to vast populations that family life properly regulated and disciplined was capable of realizing the highest that man was capable of and that too much insistence on the giving up of all desires (including desire for life) sapped the very stability and continuance of human society and

---

1654. In 'the Philosophy of the Upanishads' by Deussen tr. by A. S. Geden (1906), the distinguished author after adverting to the peculiar rights and obligations of the four life-stages (āśramas) remarks 'the entire history of mankind does not produce much that approaches in grandeur to this thought' (p. 367).

gradually led on to the loss of physical and mental virility, to idleness, base morals and race suicide. Manu III. 77-78, VI 89-90, Vas. Dh. S. VIII. 14-17, Visnu Dh. S. 59, 29, Daksa II. 57-60 and many other sages and writers praise the stage of householder as the highest.[1655] The Mahābhārata (Śānti 270. 6-11) and the Rāmāyana, Ayodhyā 106, 2) and the Purānas also sing the same tune; vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 425-426 and 540-541.

Not only Dharmaśāstras but also great poets like Kālidāsa emphasized the supreme importance of the householder's stage to society. In the Raghuvamśa[1656] (V. 10) king Raghu says to a learned brāhmana student 'it is now time for you to pass on to the second stage of life that is capable of being useful to (men of) other āsramas'. In the Śākuntala also Kālidāsa harps on the same idea.

When Buddha came to be worshipped by Buddhists as God, when Buddhists gave up the original characteristic doctrine of the attainment of the peace and bliss of *nirvāṇa* in this very life through the eradication of selfish desires by following the Noble Eightfold Path, when Buddhists adopted the doctrines of bhakti and the ideal they set up was the evolution of bodhisattvas through aeons by good deeds, the line of demarcation between Buddhism and popular Hinduism became very thin and was gradually obliterated. Buddhism disappeared from India because of these deviations from the original doctrine and because the brāhmaṇas made Hinduism very comprehensive by finding a place for purely monistic idealism, for the worship of several gods, for the performance of vedic or other religious rites (i. e. Karmamārga) as a preparation for higher spiritual life. The ultimate victory of Hinduism shows the strength and comprehensiveness of its religion and philosophy as against the onesidedness of Buddhism in its various phases and its silence on matters of great moment to the inquiring human mind.

1655. Vide यस्मात्त्रयोऽप्याश्रमिणो ज्ञानेनान्नेन चान्वहम्। गृहस्थेनैव धार्यन्ते तस्माज्ज्येष्ठाश्रमो गृही॥ मनु III. 78; मार्कण्डेयपुराण 26. 3-6 'वत्स गार्हस्थ्यमास्थाय नरः सर्वमिदं जगत्। पुष्णाति तेन लोकांश्च स जयत्यभिवाञ्छितान्॥ पितरो मुनयो देवा भूतानि मनुजास्तथा। कृमिकीटपतङ्गाश्च वयांसि पशवोऽसुराः॥ गृहस्थमुपजीवन्ति ततस्तृप्तिं प्रयान्ति च। मुखं चास्य निरीक्षन्ते अपि नो दास्यतीति वै॥ सर्वस्याधारभूतेयं वत्स धेनुस्त्रयीमयी॥ (chap. 29. 3-6 of B. I. edition).

1656. अपि प्रसन्नेन महर्षिणा त्वं सम्यग्विनीयानुमतो गृहाय। कालो ह्ययं संक्रमितुं द्वितीयं सर्वोपकारक्षममाश्रमं ते॥ रघुवंश V. 10; अध्याक्रान्ता वसतिरमुनाप्याश्रमे सर्वभोग्ये। शाकुन्तल I.

The Purāṇas and Dharmaśāstras put so much emphasis on ahiṁsā that millions of people in India became and are even now strict vegetarians not only among brāhmaṇas, but also among vaiśyas and śūdras, while it appears that Buddhists all over the world are not strict vegetarians at all. To-day very few of the ideal virtues that Buddhism set before even laymen are a matter of endeavour for most Buddhists in all lands. In spite of Buddha's crusade against animal sacrifices and Aśoka's drastic measures to eliminate the killing and cruelty to birds and beasts, it is found that some Vedic sacrifices (including animal sacrifices) continued to be performed by Indian kings and common people during the centuries before and after the Christian era. A few examples are cited here: (1) Senāpati Puṣyamitra (about 150 B. C.) performed two Aśvamedhas (E. I. vol. XX. pp 54-58, Harivaṁśa III. 2. 35 ff[1657] (which latter speaks of Senānī Kāśyapa-dvija as performer of Aśvamedha in Kali age) and Kālidāsa's Mālavikāgnimitra (Act V) where he is spoken of as engaged in Rājasūya sacrifice; (2) Khāravela, king of Kaliṅga and a Jain, performed in the 6th year of his reign a Rājasūya (E. I. XX. p. 79); (3) Bhavanāga of the Bhāraśiva lineage (about 200 A. D.) glorified as the performer of ten Aśvamedhas in Vākāṭaka plates (Chammak plate of Vākāṭaka Pravarasena II. in Gupta Inscriptions No. 55 pp. 236-237,[1658] and in Poona plates of Prabhāvatīguptā, the chief queen of Vākāṭaka Rudrasena II in E. I. vol. XV. p. 39); (4) Vākāṭaka emperor Pravarasena I. (about 250 A. D.) is described as the daughter's son of Bhavanāga and as the performer of four Aśvamedhas (in E. I. vol. XV. p. 39); (5) The great Gupta emperor Samudragupta (about 325-370 A. D.) is described in some Gupta Inscriptions as one who restored the Aśvamedha sacrifice that had long been in abeyance (vide Bilsad Stone inscription in Gupta Inscriptions No. 10 at p. 42 and the Bihar Stone pillar Inscription of Skandagupta, *ibid*,

---

1657. The reference from हरिवंश is as follows: औद्भिज्जो भविता कश्चित्सेनानीः काश्यपो द्विजः। अश्वमेधं कलियुगे पुनः प्रत्याहरिष्यति ॥ तद्युगे तत्कुलीनश्च राजसूयमपि क्रतुम्। आहरिष्यति राजेन्द्र श्वेतग्रहमिवान्तकः ॥ भविष्यपर्व 2. 40-41. Here it is said that a सेनापति of the काश्यपगोत्र will perform an अश्वमेध in कलियुग and a scion of his family will perform राजसूय.

1658. About Bhavanāga it is said 'अंसभारसंनिवेशितशिवलिङ्गोद्वहनशिवसुपरितुष्ट-समुत्पादित-राजवंशानां पराक्रमाधिगतभागीरथ्यमलजलमूर्धाभिषिक्तानां दशाश्वमेधावभृथस्नातानां भारशिवानां महाराजश्रीभवनाग-दौहित्रस्य...वाकाटकानां महाराजश्रीरुद्रसेनस्य &c.' । Gupta Inscriptions No. 55 pp. 236-237.

No. 12 at p. 51); (6) The Pallava King Śivaskanda-varman (about 300–350 A. D.) is praised as the performer of Agniṣṭoma, Vājapeya and Aśvamedha (E. I. vol. I. p. 2 at p. 5); (7) The Pallava king Siṁhavarman is spoken of as the performer of several Aśvamedhas (Pīkira grant in E. I. vol. VIII. p. 159 at p. 162); (8) Cālukya king Pulakeśi I (about 570 A. D.) performed Aśvamedha (Aihoḷe Inscription of śaka 536 in E. I. vol. VI. p. 1); (9) Cālukya king Pulakeśi II performed Aśvamedha (Aihoḷe Ins. of śaka 536 in E. I. vol. VI. p. 1 and Talamanchi plates of Vikramāditya I. in E. I. vol. IX. p. 98 in A. D. 660); (10) the Viṣṇukuṇḍin Mādhava-varmā (a relative of the Vākāṭaka family) is recorded (in E. I. vol IV. p. 196) as having performed eleven Aśvamedhas, one thousand Agni-ṣṭomas, Pauṇḍarīka,[1659] Puruṣamedha, Vājapeya, Ṣoḍaśin and Rājasūya (about the 7th or 8th century A. D.). For other instances of Aśvamedhas performed by kings, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 1238–39.

It may be noted that even learned brāhmaṇas sometimes performed eleborate Vedic sacrifices. For example, the fifth in ascent from Bhavabhūti performed a Vājapeya at Padmapura in Dakṣiṇāpatha. In the Vājapeya, seventeen was a characteristic number and seventeen animals were to be sacrificed therein. Vide for description of Vājapeya, H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 1206–1212. As Bhavabhūti flourished in the first half of the 8th century A. D., the fifth in ascent from him who performed Vājapeya must have flourished about a hundred years before him i. e. in the first half of the 7th century A. D.

In these days it has become a fashion to praise Buddha and his doctrines to the skies and to disparage Hinduism by making unfair comparisons between the original doctrines of Buddha with the present practices and shortcomings of Hindu society. The present author has to enter a strong protest against this tendency. If a fair comparison is to be made it should be made between the later phases of Buddhism and the present practices of professed Buddhists on the one hand and modern phases and practices of Hinduism on the other. The Upaniṣads had a nobler philosophy than that of Gautama the Buddha, the latter merely based his doctrines on the philosophy of the Upaniṣads. If Hinduism decayed in course of time and exhi-

---

1659. It is possible that this statement about the performance of so many solemn vedic sacrifices is boastful and exaggerated.

bited bad tendencies, the same or worse was the case with later Buddhism which gave up the noble but human Buddha, made him a god, worshipped his images and ran wild with such hideous practices as those of Vajrayāna. As a counterblast to what modern encomiasts often say about Buddhism the present author will quote a strongly-worded (but not unjust) passage from Swami Vivekānanda's lecture on "The sages of India" (Complete Works, volume III. p. 248-268, 7th ed. of 1953 published at Māyāvatī, Almora) "The earlier Buddhists in their rage against the killing of animals had denounced the sacrifices of the Vedas; and these sacrifices used to be held in every house ... ... These sacrifices were obliterated and in their place came gorgeous temples, gorgeous ceremonies and gorgeous priests and all that you see in India in modern times. I smile when I read books written by some modern people who ought to know better that the Buddha was the destroyer of Brahmanical idolatry. Little do they know that Buddhism created brahmanism and idolatry in India. ... Thus in spite of the preaching of mercy to animals, in spite of the sublime ethical religion, in spite of the hair-splitting discussions about the existence or non-existence of a permanent soul, the whole building of Buddhism tumbled down piecemeal; and the ruin was simply hideous. I have neither the time nor the inclination to describe to you the hideousness that came in the wake of Buddhism. The most hideous ceremonies, the most horrible, the most obscene books that human hands ever wrote or the human brain ever conceived, the most bestial forms that ever passed under the name of religion have all been the creation of degraded Buddhism" (pp. 264-265).

SECTION VI

CHAPTER XXVI

Tāntrik doctrines and Dharmaśāstra

In H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 739 while dealing with the worship of Durgā, who is also worshipped as Śakti (cosmic power or energy), it was stated that the influence of Śākta worship has been great throughout India and a promise was given that a brief treatment of Śāktism would follow in a later volume. It is now time to deal with Śāktas and Tantras, which exercised some influence over the Purāṇas and directly and through the Purāṇas over Indian religious ritual and practices in the medieval ages.

There is a vast literature on Tantras, published and unpublished. There are Buddhist Tantras, Hindu Trantras and Jaina Tantras. There is a philosophical or spiritual side in some of the Tantras which has not been much studied except by Arthur Avalon, B. Bhattacharya and a few others. In the popular mind Tantras have been associated with the worship of Śakti (Goddess Kālī), with mudrās, mantras, maṇḍalas, the five *makāras*, the Dakṣiṇamārga and the Vāma-mārga, and magic practices for acquiring supernatural powers. All that can and will be attempted here is to trace briefly the origin of Śāktism and Tantra and point out some of the ways in which *tantra* has entered into Hindu ritual directly and indirectly through the Purāṇas.

The Amarakośa states that *tantra* means 'principal matter or part', 'siddhānta' (i. e. doctrine or śāstra), a loom or paraphernalia. But it does not state that tantra means a certain peculiar class of works. Therefore, the inference is not altogether unjustifiable that in its time works bearing the peculiar character of what are called Tantras were either not composed or had not at least attained great vogue. In Ṛg. X. 71. 9 the word 'tantra' occurs and appears to mean a loom. 'These ignorant[1660] men do not move about lower down (in this world) nor in a higher

---

1660. इमे येऽर्वाङ् न परश्चरन्ति न ब्राह्मणासो न सुतेकरासः। त एते वाचमभिपद्य पापया सिरीस्तन्त्रं तन्वते अप्रजज्ञयः॥ ऋ. X. 71. 9. सायण explains: सिरिः सीरिणो भूत्वा तन्त्रं कृषिलक्षणं तन्वते विस्तारयन्ति कुर्वन्तीत्यर्थः।.

world, being neither (learned) brāhmaṇas nor some-extracting priests; these resort to speech (of a vile kind) and with that vile speech they engage in handling ploughs and looms'. The Atharvaveda (X. 7. 42) ('tantram-eke yuvatī virūpe abhyākrāmam vayataḥ saṇ-mayūkham') employs the word tantra in the same sense and so does the Tai. Br. II. 5. 5. 3 in a closely similar passage. Pāṇini (V. 2. 70) derives the word 'tantraka' (a cloth that is recently taken away from a loom) from '*tantra*'. The Āp. Śr. employs the word[1661] tantra in the sense of 'procedure containing many parts'. The Śāṅ. Śr. applies the word tantra to what being once done serves the purpose of many other actions. The Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini IV. 2. 60 and Vārtika 'sarvasāder-dvigośca laḥ' cites 'sarvatantraḥ' and 'dvitantraḥ' as examples meaning 'one who has studied all the tantras' or 'one who has studied two tantras', tantra probably meaning 'siddhānta'. In Yāj. I. 228 ('tantram va vaiśva-devikam') the word tantra is employed in the sense in which the commentary on the Śān. Śr. takes it. The 15th adhikaraṇa of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra bears the title 'Tantrayukti' (vide J. O. R., Madras, vol. 4, 1930, p. 82 ff) meaning the main canons or propositions or principles of exposition of a śāstra. Caraka (Siddhisthāna, chap. 12. 40-45) also speaks of '36 tantrasya yuktayaḥ' and Suśruta (Uttara-tantra, chap. 65) names 32 tantrayuktis. In Bṛhaspati and Kātyāyana and in the Bhāgavata the word tantra is employed in the sense of 'doctrine' or 'śāstra'. Śabara in his *bhāṣya* on Jaimini XI. I. 1 remarks that when any thing or act, once done, becomes useful in several[1662] matters, that is called 'tantra'. Saṅkarācārya in several passages of his bhāṣya on the Vedānta-sūtras speaks of the Sāṅkhya system as sāṅkhya-tantra and of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā as 'prathama-tantra'.[1663] In the Kālikā-

---

1661. उदित आदित्ये पौर्णमास्यास्तन्त्रं प्रक्रमयति प्रागुदयादमावास्यायाः । आप. श्रौ. I. 15.1, on which the com. says 'अङ्गसमुदायस्तन्त्रम् । तत्प्रक्रमयति यजमानोऽध्वर्युणा.' 'तन्त्रलक्षणं तत् ।' शा. श्रौ. I. 16 6 on which the com. says 'यत्सकृत्कृतं बहूनामुपकरोति तत्तन्त्रमित्युच्यते ।'.

1662. आम्नाये स्मृतितन्त्रे च लोकाचारे च सूरिभिः । शरीरार्धं स्मृता जाया पुण्यापुण्यफले समा ॥ बृहस्पति q. by अपरार्क p. 740, दायभाग XI. 1. 2 p. 149, कुल्लूक on मनु IX 187; आत्मतन्त्रे तु यच्चोक्तं तत्कुर्यात्पारतन्त्रिकम् । q. from कात्यायन by स्मृतिच. p. 5; तन्त्रं सात्वतमाचष्ट नैष्कर्म्यं कर्मणो यतः । भागवत I. 3. 8. Here the पञ्चरात्र is called सात्वततन्त्र. 'यत्सकृत्कृतं बहूनामुपकरोति तत्तन्त्रमित्युच्यते यथा बहूनां ब्राह्मणानां मध्ये कृतः प्रदीपः ।' शबर's भाष्य on जै. XI. 4. 1.

1663. On वे. सू. II. 2. 1 the Śāṅkara-bhāṣya says 'तथापि महाजनपरिगृहीतानि महान्ति सांख्यादितन्त्राणि ... सम्यग्दर्शनायोपादेयानीत्यपेक्षा &c.'; vide also भाष्य

(*Continued on next page*)

purāṇa (87. 130) the works of Uśanas and Bṛhaspati on Rājanīti (the science of statecraft) are called tantras and in 92. 2 the Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa is called tantra. In all these cases the peculiar meaning attached to the word tantra in medieval times does not occur.

It is difficult to determine the exact[1664] time when the word tantra came to be employed in the sense in which it is used in the so-called tantra literature nor is it possible to decide what people first introduced tantra principles and practices or where they first arose. M. M. Haraprasad Shastri was inclined to hold that the principles and practices of tantra came to India from outside and he relies mainly on a verse in the Kubjikāmatatantra[1665]

(*Continued from last page*)

on V. S. II. 1. 1, and II. 4. 9 (where a half verse from सांख्यकारिका 29 'सामान्यकरणवृत्तिः प्राणाद्या वायवः पञ्च' is cited as belonging to तन्त्रान्तर. The सांख्यकारिका itself calls सांख्य system 'Tantra' in verse 70 'tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram'. On वे. सू. III. 3. 53 the पूर्वमीमांसासूत्र is referred to as 'प्रथमे तन्त्रे' in the भाष्य.

1664. Vide Dr. B. Bhattacharya's Intro. to Buddhist Esoterism (p. 43), which work will be referred to hereafter as B. E.

1665. I. H. Q. Vol. IX p. 358 f. n. 'गच्छ त्वं भारते वर्षे अधिकाराय सर्वतः। पीठोपपीठक्षेत्रेषु कुरु सृष्टिमनेकधा॥'. Vide H. P. Sastri's Cat. of Palm-leaf mss. in Nepal Durbar Library (Calcutta, 1905), Preface p. LXXIX, for the verse in Kubjikāmata, the ms. of which is written in late Gupta characters (i. e. about 7th century A. D.). Dr. B. Bhattacharya appears to hold the same opinion (p. 43 of the work cited in the preceding note). Arthur Avalon in Mahānirvāṇatantra (3rd ed. of 1953 p. 560) holds that tantra was brought into India from Chaldea or Śakadvīpa. In 'Modern Review' for 1934 pp. 150–156 Prof. N. N. Choudhuri tries to prove that Indian tāntricism has its origin in the Bon religion of Tibet. He relies on the Tibetan tradition of Asaṅga having introduced Tāntricism in India. But that tradition is mainly based on Taranath's History of Buddhism. Lama Taranath was born in 1573 A. D. (1575 A. D. according to some) and completed his history in 1608 i. e. he wrote about twelve hundred years after Asaṅga. Prof. Choudhuri further relies on the colophon to Ekajaṭāsādhana (in Sādhanamālā No. 127, आर्यनागार्जुनपादैर्भोटेषु उद्धृतमिति). But this sentence is dropped in three out of the eight mss. on which the edition is based. Prof. Choudhuri further asserts that the guru's position 'in tantra' is neither Vaidika nor Paurāṇika. Here he is wrong. The Vidyāsūkta in Nirukta (II. 4) and the passage of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad quoted in note 1540 make the Vaidika position of the guru clear. As for the Paurāṇika position of guru, vide the Liṅgapurāṇa (quoted in note 1718 below) and Devībhāgavata (XI. I. 49 'Gurur-brahmā' &c. in the same note) and the verse 'यस्य देवे परा भक्तिर्यथा देवे तथा गुरौ॥ तस्यैते कथिता ह्यर्थाः प्रकाशन्ते महात्मनः॥' श्वेताश्व० उप. VI. 23 and अग्निपु. 392. 6.

which says 'go thou to the country of Bhārata for exercising dominance on all sides and bring about new creation in various ways in *pīthas*, *upapīṭhas* and *kṣetras*'. With all respect to that great scholar it has to be said that the passage does not affirm that tantra principles were then unknowe in India and were first introduced in Bhārata after that verse was uttered. That passage could very well have been uttered even when tantra practices had already taken hold of people's minds in India and the reference to pīṭhas and ksetras (in the verse) clearly indicates that what is meant is only a record of an existing fact, just as the Purāṇas speak in a prophetic vein about what is past. It is possible that a few mystic practices of *Kulācāra* or *Vāmācāra* owe their origin to foreign elements or sources. But the one verse on which M. M. H. P. Shastri relied is far too inadequate for *proving* this. The Rudrayāmala (ed. by Jivananda, 1892) contains a panegyric of the Atharvaveda (17th patala, verse 4), saying that all gods, all beings (on land, in water and air), all sages, Kāmavidyā and Mahāvidyā dwell in it; verses 10-17 dwell upon the mysterious Kuṇḍalinī, verses 31 ff dilate upon Yogic practices and six *cakras* in the body, verses 51-53 mention Kāmarūpa, Jālandhara, Pūrnagiri, Uḍḍiyāna, and a few others as Kālikā pīṭhas. Bagchi (in 'Studies in Tantra' pp. 45-55) adduces some evidence of foreign elements in the tāntrik doctrines. The Rudrayāmala[1666] (17th Paṭala, verses 119-125) states that Mahāvidyā appeared to sage Vasiṣṭha and asked him to go to Cīnadeśa and Buddha, who is said to have taught Vasiṣṭha the *Kaula* path, Yoga practices for the attainment of siddhis (extraordinary powers) and directed him to make use of five *makāras* (*madya* &c.) in his *sādhanā* for becoming a perfect Yogin. All this shows that pīthas flourished in India when the Rudrayāmála was composed, that Tāntrik practices had grown in China or Tibet and that Buddha was deemed to have taught those practices, which is a libel and a vile travesty of Buddha's noble teaching.

1666. यः कुलार्थी सिद्धमन्त्री भवेद्वाचारनिर्मलः। प्राप्नोति साधनं पुण्यं वेदानामप्यगोचरम् ॥ बौद्धदेशेऽथर्ववेदे महाचीने सदा व्रज ॥ ...मत्कुलज्ञो महर्षे त्वं महासिद्धो भविष्यसि ॥ ...ततो मुनिवरः श्रुत्वा महाविद्यासरस्वतीम् । जगाम चीनभूमौ च यत्र बुद्धः प्रतिष्ठति ॥ ...बुद्ध उवाच । वसिष्ठ शृणु वक्ष्यामि कुलमार्गमनुत्तमम् । येन विज्ञान(त ?)मात्रेण रुद्ररूपी भवेत्क्षणात् ॥ ...अतः कुलं समाश्रित्य सर्वसिद्धीश्वरो भव ॥ मासेनाकर्षणं सिद्धिर्द्विमासे वाक्पतिर्भवेत् । ...शक्तिं विना शिवोऽशक्तः किमन्ये जडबुद्धयः । इत्युक्त्वा बुद्धरूपी च कारयामास साधनम् ॥ कुरु विप्र महाशक्तिसेवनं मद्यसाधनम् । ...माविरासाधनं कर्तुं जगाम कुलमण्डले । मद्यं मांसं तथा मत्स्यं मुद्रा मैथुनमेव च ॥ पुनः पुनः साधयित्वा पूर्णयोगी बभूव सः ॥ रुद्रयामल, 17th पटल verses 121-123, 125, 135, 152-153, 157-158, 160-161.

Magic spells are found in plenty in the Atharvaveda and some mystic words or syllables are used even in the Ṛgveda; e. g. the word 'vaṣaṭ' occurs in Ṛg. VII. 99. 7, VII. 100. 7 and other verses and the word *svāhā*[1667] occurs over a dozen times in the Ṛgveda (e. g. in I. 13. 12, V. 5, 11, VII. 2. 11). A sleep-inducing spell occurs in Ṛg. VII. 55. 5–8,[1668] which verses occur also in the Atharvaveda IV. 5. 6, 5, 1, 3 and which spell was probably employed by a *purohita* to put to sleep some noble man complaining of sleeplessness at night. Some Western scholars have held that this hymn is a lover's charm for a clandestine meeting with his lady-love. But the whole hymn has hardly any words of love in it and the author is not able to accept that theory as proved. Ṛgveda X. 145 is a hymn to be employed against a co-wife, the first verse of which is 'I dig up this herb, which is a most powerful creeper, by which (a woman) injures her co-wife and by which she secures her husband (to herself alone)'.

The Ṛgveda frequently mentions magicians who appear to have been mostly non-Aryans described as *adeva* (godless), *anṛtadeva* (worshipping false gods), śiśnadeva (lecherous, Ṛg. VII. 21. 5, X. 99. 3). For reasons of space, it is not possible to go into great details. Tāntrik works describe the six cruel acts which will be dealt with later on. In the Vedic times it was supposed that some wicked people could by charms and incantations bring about the death of men and animals or make them ill. Two long hymns (VII. 104 and X. 87 both containing 25 verses) are enough to show how the Ṛgveda people were afraid of black magic. Both hymns are full of the words '*Yātudhāna*' (one who employs black magic) and 'rakṣas' (devil or evil spirit), the word yātu being the same as '*jādu*' (employed in Marathi and other regional Indian languages). There were female evil spirits also called 'piśāci' (Ṛg. I. 133. 5 'O Indra! destroy the reddish very powerful piśāci and kill all evil spirits)'. A few verses from the Ṛgveda may be translated

1667. In the Tantras the word 'svāhā' in mantras is indicated by such a word as 'wife of Agni'. Vide Tāntrik Texts, vol. 7, where स्वाहा is called वह्निजाया, ज्वलनवल्लभा and द्विठ, also शारदातिलक VI. 62–63.

1668. सस्तु माता सस्तु पिता सस्तु श्वा सस्तु विश्पतिः। ससन्तु सर्वे ज्ञातयः सस्त्वयमभितो जनः॥ य आस्ते यश्च चरति यश्च पश्यति नो जनः। तेषां सं हन्मो अक्षाणि यथेदं हर्म्यं तथा। ...प्रोष्ठेशया वह्येशया नारीर्यास्तल्पशीवरीः। स्त्रियो याः पुण्यगन्धास्ताः सर्वाः स्वापयामसि॥ ऋ. VII. 55. 5–8.

here. 'May I (Vasiṣṭha) die this very day if I be a practitioner of black magic or if I have scorched the life of any person; may he, who falsely called me a practitioner of black magic, lose his ten sons; may Indra kill with a terrible weapon him who called me *yātudhāna,* though I am not so and who, being himself a rakṣas, declares himself to be pure; may he, being most wretched, fall below all beings (Ṛg. VII. 104. 15–16); O Maruts! may you spread in different places among the people, and wish to seize the devils and pound to dust the devils (rakṣasaḥ) who assuming the form of birds fly about at night and who, when the sacrifice is shining, produce deadly obstacles (*ibid.* verse 18); O Indra! kill the male practitioner of black magic and also the female (magician) that destroys with wiles; may the (devils) worshippers of foolish deities perish with their necks cut off; and may they not be able to see the sun rising (Ṛg. VII 104. 24); O Agni, split the skin of the yātudhāna, may thy destructive bolt kill him by its heat; O Jātavedas! shatter his joints, may some carnivorous beast longing for flesh seek (devour) the broken (yātudhāna); O Agni! shatter the yātudhānas by your heat, and the rakṣas by your glow and destroy the worshippers of foolish gods (*mūradevān*) and, shining towards those that feed on the lives of men (*asutṛpaḥ*), shatter them' (Ṛg. X. 87. 5 and 14).

In the Āp. Gṛ. (III. 9. 5–8) it is said that the plant used by the co-wife is called Pāṭhā and the hymn (Ṛg. X. 145) is employed for securing domination over the husband and for harming a co-wife. Ṛg. I. 191 is a charm against various poisons. In the Atharvaveda there are numerous hymns styled 'śatrunāśana' (destructive of enemies) e. g. II. 12–24, III. 6, IV. 3 and 40, V. 8, VI. 6, 65-67 and 134. Atharva II. 11 is styled 'Kṛtyā-dūṣaṇa' (counteracting black magic). A few of the typical verses may be cited[1669] here. 'Employ magic spells against him, who hates us and whom we hate; attain (i. e. dominate) him who is superior and surpass him who is (our) equal'; 'O Soma! strike in the mouth with your thunderbolt him who speaks evil of us that speak what is good and may he, being crushed, run away'. The Śukranītisāra (ed. by G. Oppert, 1882) provides that the Tantras are the Upaveda of the

---

1669. प्रति तमभि चर योऽस्मान् द्वेष्टि यं वयं द्विष्मः। आप्नुहि श्रेयांसमति समं क्राम॥ अथर्व II. 11. 3; यो नः सोम सुशंसिनो दुःशंस आदिदेशति। वज्रेणास्य मुखे जहि स संपिष्टो अपायति॥ अथर्व VI. 6. 2; विविधोपास्यमन्त्राणां प्रयोगाः सुविभेदतः। कथिताः सोपसंहारास्तद्धर्मनियमैश्च यत्। अथर्वणां चोपवेदस्तन्त्ररूपः स एव हि॥ शुक्रनीतिसार IV. 3. 39.

Atharvaveda. Atharva III. 25 and VI. 130 are spells respectively employed by a man and a woman to soften the heart of the person loved; Atharva II. 30 and 31 are charms for driving away or destroying worms that cause diseases and V. 36 is a charm against *piśācas* (goblins).[1670] The sound 'phaṭ' occurs in Vāj. S. In the Āp. Śr. Sūtra *phaṭ* is employed in offering Soma stalks in *abhicāra* (employment of spells for a malevolent purpose). Phaṭ is a sound frequently employed in the worship of Devī in Tantra works. But no direct connection or line of evolution from the Atharvaveda to the Tantras can be traced. The Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita (705–762 A. D.) connects even Buddha with magic practices. It says 'all wise men declare that it is dharma from which results worldly prosperity and the highest beatitude. Seen results such as intelligence, health, rulership are produced by properly observing the rules about mantras, yoga and the like declared by him (i. e.[1671] by Buddha)'. But one cannot place implicit reliance on any writer's statement made more than a thousand years after the event or person referred to in it. There are, however, stories in the Pali sacred books about the cultivation of magic powers among Buddha's own disciples, e. g. the story of Bhāradvāja[1672] who rose in the air for a bowl carved out of very fragrant

---

1670. For the sound 'phaṭ' in Durgā-pūjā, vide p. 161 n. 416; उपरि प्रता भङ्गेन हतोऽसौ फट् प्राणाय त्वा व्यानाय त्वा। वाज. सं. VII. 3. on which the com. महीधर explains 'उपरि आगतेन भङ्गेन आमर्देन असाविति देवदत्तादिनामनिर्देशः। असौ द्वेषो हतो निहतः सन् फट् विशीर्णो भवतु। ...स्वाहाकारस्थाने फडिति अभिचारे प्रयुज्यते।

1671. यतोऽभ्युदयनिष्पत्तिर्यतो निःश्रेयसस्य च। स धर्म उच्यते तादृक् सर्वैरेव विचक्षणैः॥ तदुक्तमन्त्रयोगादिनियमाद्विधिवत्कृतात्। प्रज्ञारोग्यविभुत्वादि दृष्टधर्मोऽपि जायते॥ तत्त्वसंग्रह p. 905; कमलशील (pupil of शान्तरक्षित) comments 'तेन भगवतोक्तश्चासौ मन्त्रयोगादिनियमश्चेति विग्रहः। योगः समाधिः। आदिशब्देन मुद्रामण्डलादिपरिग्रहः।'. The first verse appears to have been based on the वैशेषिकसूत्र I. 1. 1–2 'अथातो धर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः। यतोऽभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससिद्धिः स धर्मः।'. The word अभ्युदय has been variously interpreted by the commentators of Kaṇāda's sūtra, but generally अभ्युदय means 'wordly happiness or prosperity'; compare भरत's नाट्यशास्त्र 'विवाहप्रसवावाहप्रमोदाभ्युदयादिषु। विनोदकरणं चैव नृत्तमेतत्प्रकीर्तितम्॥' chap. IV. 263 (G. O. S.). Some take it to mean स्वर्ग in contradistinction to निःश्रेयस (which means मोक्ष or अमृतत्व).

1672. The story of Puṇḍola Bhāradvāja, a disciple of the Blessed One (Buddha) rising in the air, taking the bowl and going thrice round the city of Rājagṛha in the air, is narrated in Cullavagga (S. B. E. Vol. XX pp 78 ff). But it is said there that Buddha rebuked his disciple, ordered that bowl to be broken and reduced to powder.

sandalwood. Further, there is a story of miraculous powers possessed by all the members of the family of a layman called Mendaka (viz. himself, his wife, son and daughter-in-law) in Mahāvagga VI. 34. 1 ff. (S. B. E. vol. XVII. pp. 121 ff). Here again we have to remember that there is nothing in the *Tipiṭaka* or any early Buddhist document to prove that Buddha or his first disciples had anything to do with *mudrās*, mantras and *maṇḍalas* and that neither Yuan Chwang nor I-tsing refers to any Tantras, though both of them refer to the Buddhist monasteries as centres of Buddhist culture (vide Dr. De in N. I. A. vol. I. pp. 1 ff). In the introduction to Sādhanamālā (vol. II, LXVIII.) Dr. Bhattacharya relies upon the words 'Sugatopadiṣṭam' and 'Sugataiḥ' occurring on pp. 334–335 of the Sādhanamālā for holding that Buddha himself must have promulgated some mantras. There are two weighty objections viz. 'Sugataiḥ' does not always mean Buddha, but means also 'followers of Buddha' and secondly, just as most Hindu Tantras are dialogues between Śiva and Pārvatī, so later Buddhist writers might have easily said that they are quoting the Buddha; the same objection applies to Kamalaśīla's remarks quoted by Dr. Bhattacharya, as Kamalaśīla and his teacher flourished about 1200 years after Buddha.

The question whether Buddhist Tantras were prior to Hindu Tantras or *vice versa* is difficult to decide. It appears probable that both arose nearly about the same time. Vide 'The Śāktas' by E. A. Payne pp. 72–74 for discussion of views. In the Sādhanamālā (a Vajrayāna work consisting of 312 small works composed according to Dr. Bhattacharya from the 3rd century A. D. to 12th century A. D.) four *pīṭhas* (chief centres) of Vajrayāna[1673] are mentioned viz. Kāmākhyā, Sirihaṭṭa (or Śrīhaṭṭa), Pūrṇagiri and Uḍḍiyāna. The first two are respec-

1673. It appears that in some Tantra works five Pīṭhas are named (according to H P. Sastri's Cat. of Nepal Palm-leaf and selected paper mss. in the Nepal Durbar Library, Calcutta, 1905, p. LXXX) viz. Oḍiyāna (in Orissa, says H. P. Sastri), Jāla (in Jalandar), Pūrṇa Mataṅga in Śrīśaila and Kāmākhyā in Assam. The very fact that five pīṭhas are named in the work supposed to be delivered by Śiva shows beyond doubt that before the work Tāntrism had spread in all parts of India. The Sādhanamālā (vol II pp. 453 and 455) mentions Uḍḍiyāna, Pūrṇagiri, Kāmākhyā and Sirihaṭṭa; the Kulacūḍāmaṇitantra (Tāntrik texts, Vol. IV) in 6th paṭala verses 3–7) refers to five pīṭhas viz. Uḍḍiyāna, Kāmarūpa, Kāmākhyā, Jālandhara and

(*Continued on next page*)

tively identified with Kāmākhyā or Kāmarūpa (three miles from Gauhati) and modern Sylhet. The exact situation of the other two is a controversial matter. M. M. H. P. Shastri identified Uddiyāna (which is most frequently mentioned as a pītha) with Orissa. His son Dr. B. Bhattacharya thinks it most probable that Vajrayāna Tāntricism arose in Uddiyāna (p. 46 of Intro. to B. E.). Dr. Bagchi in 'Studies in the Tantras' pp. 37–40 furnishes good grounds for holding that Uddiyāna was near Swat valley in N. W. India and Grousset 'In the footsteps of Buddha' pp. 109–110 holds the same view. The Bārhaspatya-sūtra (ed. by F. W. Thomas) names eight Śāktakṣetras (III. 123–124). In his Intro. to Sādhanamālā (vol. II. p. LXXVIII) Dr. Bhattacharya holds that the Hindu tantras were introduced on the model of the Buddhist tantras. But Winternitz (in 'History of Indian Literature', Eng. tr., vol. II. p. 401) states that this view of Dr. Bhattacharya is contrary to the facts and the present writer agrees with this view.

Though Dr. Bhattacharya admits that Buddhism and Jainism exploited Hindu gods in the earlier period, he asserts (on p. 147 of his Intro. to B. E.) that 'it is possible to declare without fear of contradiction that the Buddhists were the first to introduce the Tantras in their religion and that the Hindus borrowed them from the Buddhists in later times'. It is no honour to ancient Hindus to be called the pioneers in the practice of black magic. But scholars have to seek truth irrespective of the question of honour or dishonour. Very weighty arguments are advanced by Valleé Poussin (in E. R. E. vol. XII. p. 193), Winternitz and Payne (on 'Śāktas p. 73) for the opposite view and the present author agrees with them. Hundreds of works were translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan and Chinese. The traffic of borrowing has been all one way from India to Tibet and China. Vide a paper on 'China's debt to India' by Prof. Liang Chi Chao in Viśvabhāratī Quarterly, vol. II. for 1924–25 pp. 251–261, where it is stated that 24 Hindu scholars from A. D. 67 to 789 came to China, besides 13 from Kashmir and that the Chinese scholars that went to India for study from 265–790 A. D. numbered 187 of which the names of 105 can be ascertained.

(Continued from last page)

Pūrṇagiri (vide also 3rd paṭala, 59–61). In I. H. Q. vol. XI. pp 142–144 it is argued that Uḍḍiyāna and Śahore are in Bengal. The Devībhāgavata (VII. 30. 55–80) names over one hundred kṣetras of Devī.

There is hardly any evidence of the translations of Chinese or Tibetan works into Sanskrit. Besides, the three great Chinese travellers never refer to the study of Buddhist Tantras in India. Watters on 'Yuan Chwang's Travels in India' vol. I. p. 360 narrates a story from the pilgrim's life that when he left Ayodhyā in a boat and proceeded east down the Ganges, *thugs* that looted the boat decided to sacrifice him to Durgā but that the Chinese pilgrim was saved by a hurricane which put the thugs in terror, who released him and treated him with reverence. Vide also 'In the Footsteps of Buddha' by René Grousset pp. 133-135 for this incident. We see that there is evidence of the prevalence of Tāntrik and Śākta worship in India long before the 7th century A. D. There is hardly any evidence of any Buddhist Tāntrik work before 650 A. D. except perhaps the Guhyasamājatantra and Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, both of which contain late elements. In this way, presumption and chronology are both against borrowing by Hinduism from Buddhist Tibetan or Chinese Tāntrik works. Vide 'Tibet past and present' by Sir Charles Bell (1924) pp. 23, 25, 29, Sardar K. M. Panikkar's work 'India and China' (1957) p. 70, 'Introduction of the alphabet in Tibet' by M. M. Dr. Satischandra who holds that it was borrowed from Magadha in 7th Century A. D., that show that a written script based on an Indian alphabet as prevalent in Kashmir was first introduced about 640 A. D., that the Tāntrik Buddhist Padmasambhava was summoned from Uḍḍiyāna by a Tibetan king Ti-son De-tson (749-786 A. D.) on the recommendation of Śāntarakṣita Bodhisattva and was induced to settle in Tibet. Bunjiu Nanjio's 'Catalogue of Tripiṭaka' (Oxford, 1883), appendix II. p. 445 No. 155 shows that Amoghavajra translated many works between 746 and 771 A. D., died in 774 A. D. and that it was under his influence that Tantra doctrines gained currency in China. It is clear from the works of Bāṇa as detailed later on that worship of Caṇḍikā with wine and flesh was prevalent in India long before 600 A. D., that Śrīparvata was famed for its tāntrik *siddhis*, that Śivasaṁhitās existed, that japa of mantras a crore of times in a cemetery was supposed to confer *siddhis*, that he 14th of the dark half of a month was deemed the proper tithi for japa and black magic. Therefore, it is most likely that Śākta or Tāntrik doctrines were taken to China and Tibet from India and not *vice versa*. Prof. P. V. Bapat in '2500 years of Buddhism' (pp. 360-376) follows (at p. 363) Dr. B. Bhattacharya and tries to prove that Tibetan Tāntrism is earlier than Hindu Tāntrism, but his arguments

like those of Dr. Bhattacharya do not carry conviction at all. Dr. A. S. Altekar in his paper on Sanskrit Literature in Tibet (ABORI. vol. 35 pp. 54–66) shows how Buddhism entered into Tibet in the reign of Strong-Tsan-Gampo (637–693 A. D.), that about 750 A. D. ;Padmasambhava from Orissa and Vairocana from Kashmir were pioneers and how about 4500 works were translated into Tibetan.

Even Dr. Bhattacharya admits that Buddhist Tantras in outward appearance resemble in a marked degree Hindu Tantras (p. 47 of Intro. to B. E.), but he contends that in the subject matter, the philosophical doctrines and religious principles there is little similarity. As Buddhism did not believe in Hindu gods they do not speak about Śakti or Śāktism. But just as in Hindu Tantras there is the male principle Śiva and the female principle of Devī, the Buddhists postulate Prajñā (which is feminine) and Upāya (masculine) as two principles and invest them with the same roles as those of Śiva and Devī but reversed in character. They had to graft on the idea of *Śūnyatā* the ideas underlying the concepts of Śiva and Devī or Śakti. The subject matter is very similar as regards the goal and means (Yoga &c) and the procedure of mantra, guru, maṇḍala &c. is the same. The most important and early works of Buddhist Tāntric cult, the Prajñopāya-viniścayasiddhi and Jñānasiddhi are not earlier than the 8th century A. D., when Śāktism and Tāntrism had both been long established in India.

The word 'Śākta' means one who is a worshipper or devotee of 'Śakti' (cosmic power or energy). It appears that long before the 8th century A. D. this cult had spread in almost all parts of India, particularly in Bengal and Assam. Śakti under different names (such as Tripurā, Lohitā, Ṣḍaśikā, Kāmeśvarī) was conceived to be the primordial principle of all activity in the universe and is generally worshipped under the name of Devī. The Devīmāhātmya is one of the chief works of the Śāktas and has been described above on pp. 155–156. The chief characteristics of the Śākta cult are the doctrine that God or Deity is one and is to be conceived as the mother and also the destroyer[1674] and that there is a special form of ceremonial

1674. One of the *dhyānas* of Devī as Kālī is as follows: शवारूढां महाभीमां घोरदंष्ट्रां हसन्मुखीम्। चतुर्भुजां खड्गमुण्ड-वराभयकरां शिवाम्। मुण्डमालाधरां देवीं ललज्जिह्वां दिगम्बराम्। एवं सञ्चिन्तयेत्कालीं श्मशानालयवासिनीम्॥ कालीतन्त्र in शाक्तप्रमोद (Venk. ed.)

worship which sometimes assumed debased and revolting forms. Devī has been eulogised in other Purāṇas also as in Vāmana (18–19), Devī-bhāgavata (III. 27), Brahmāṇḍa (that contains the Lalitāmāhātmya in 44 chapters), Matsya (13. 24–54, where 108 names of Devī and 108 places of her worship are set out), Kūrma (I. 12). In the last Purāṇa (Kūrma I. 12) Devī is called Mahāmahiṣamardinī (98), Anāhatā, Kuṇḍalinī (128), Durgā, Kātyāyanī, Caṇḍī, Bhadrakālī (143 and 148) and it is stated that the śāstras opposed[1675] to the Veda and Smṛti that are popular among people such as Kāpāla, Bhairava, Yāmala, Vāma, Ārhata were propagated by Devī for deluding the world and were based on ignorance. Vide also Brahmapurāṇa (181. 48–52) for names of Devī and for the proposition that Devī when worshipped with offerings of wine, flesh and other edibles becomes pleased and grants men's desires. Bhadrakālī is comparatively an ancient name. In the Śāṅ. Gṛ. (SBE vol. XXIX p. 86) it is provided that an offering is to be made to Śrī at the head of the bed on which the householder sleeps and at the foot of the bed to Bhadra-kālī, while Manu provides that, in the daily *baliharaṇa*, *bali* (offering) is to be offered to Bhadrakālī in the south-west.

The Tantras and Śākta works have much in common, the main point of difference being that in the Śākta cult Devī (or Śakti) is worshipped as the highest, while Tantras (which include also Buddhist and Jaina works) are not restricted to the worship of Devī or Śakti, but may be agnostic, Vedāntic or Sāṅkhya in their philosophical outlook. Dr. B. Bhattacharya (in Intro. to Gubyasamājatantra p. XXXIV and in Intro. to Sādhanamālā vol. II, p. XIX) states that, for a work to be called a real Tantra, there must be the element of Śakti in it. But this is plainly rather an over-statement. The Vāyupurāṇa enumerates the Śākta among six *darśanas* (philosophic points of view) as in note [1675a].

Even the Ṛgveda speaks of the Śaktis of the great gods of the Vedic pantheon. But the Śakti or Śaktis are of the God

---

1675. यानि शास्त्राणि दृश्यन्ते लोकेऽस्मिन्विविधानि तु। श्रुतिस्मृतिविरुद्धानि निष्ठा तेषां हि तामसी॥ कापालं भैरवं चैव यामलं वाममार्हतम्। एवंविधानि चान्यानि मोहनार्थानि तानि तु॥ कूर्म I. 12. 261–262. These verses are quoted by रघुनन्दन in स्मृतितत्त्व I. pp. 785–786 (under मलमासतत्त्व).

1675 a. ब्राह्मं शैवं वैष्णवं च सौरं शाक्तं तथार्हतम्। षड्दर्शनानि चोक्तानि स्वभावनियतानि च। 104, 16.

himself and not a separate creative principle and sometimes Śakti is meant as part of the poet, priest or sacrificer (as in Ṛg. I. 31. 18, I. 83. 3, IV. 22. 8, X. 25. 5). The word 'Śakti' occurs in the Ṛgveda about a dozen times in the singular as well as in the plural, five times with Indra,[1676] once with Aśvins (Ṛg. II. 39. 7), twice with pitṛs (I 109. 3, VI. 75. 9) and once with gods in general (X. 88. 10, who are said to have created Agni with their powers). Sometimes, the word 'Māyā' is used with regard to Indra instead of the word Śakti. 'O Indra! I long for your great friendship and powers (śaktīḥ)...understand that you are our great protector; I proclaim your ancient and recent deeds, O Indra endowed with powers (Śaktīvaḥ)! ......; 'Indra assuming[1677] many forms by his powers (māyābhiḥ) repairs (to many sacrifices), ten hundred horses are yoked to his chariot'. In these passages there is no question of worshipping śakti or śaktis of the god praised. The more frequent word, however, is 'Śacī' ('śacībhiḥ' occurring 36 times and 'śacyā' 12 times). The word 'Śacīpati' (lord of Śacī or power) occurs sixteen times in the Ṛgveda and has been applied in all places to Indra, except once in Ṛg. VII. 67. 5 (where it is applied to Aśvins). It cannot be said that in the Ṛgveda 'Śacī' is the wife of Indra (as it is said in later mythology), since the plural is more frequent than Śacī in the singular and since Aśvins also are called 'Śacīpatī'. once. Similarly, the word 'Śacīvaḥ' occurs eleven times, in nine of which it is addressed to Indra but it is once applied to Agni (Ṛg. III. 21. 4) and once to Soma (Ṛg. IX. 87. 9). The ideas associated with the words 'Śakti' and 'Śacī' are those of creation, protection, valour, and bounty. In Ṛg. I. 56. 4 Indra's power is called 'Devī taviṣī' but the word Śacī does not occur in that verse. There is a sublime hymn (Ṛg. X. 125) of the power of Vāk (speech), wherein Vāk is said to associate with Rudras, Ādityas, Vasus, all gods and is

---

1676. मह्या ते सख्यं वश्मि शक्तीरा वृत्रघ्ने नियुतो यन्ति पूर्वीः । महि स्तोत्रमव आगन्म सूरेरस्माकं सु मघवन् बोधि गोपाः ॥ ऋ. III. 31. 14, प्र ते पूर्वाणि करणानि वोचं प्र नूतना मघवन्या चकर्थ । शक्तीवो यद्विभरा रोदसी उभे जयन्नपो मनवे दानुचित्राः ॥ ऋ. V. 31. 6. Vide also Ṛg. VII. 20. 10, X. 88. 10 (स्तोमेन हि दिवि देवासो अग्निमजीजनञ्छक्तिभी रोदसिप्राम् ।'.

1677. इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयते युक्ता ह्यस्य हरयः शता दश ॥ ऋ. VI. 47. 18. On this the बृह. उप. II. 5. 19 says 'इदं वै तन्मधु दध्यङ्ङाथर्वणोऽश्विभ्यामुवाच । तदेतदृषिः पश्यन्नवोचत् । इन्द्रो मायाभिः ''' शता दश ॥ इति । अयं वै हरयोऽयं वै दश च सहस्राणि बहूनि चानन्तानि च । तदेतद्ब्रह्म &c.'

declared to support Mitra and Varuṇa, Indra and Agni, the Aśvins, Soma, Tvaṣṭṛ, Pūṣan and Bhaga. Vāk is said to stretch the bow for Rudra in order that the destructive enemy of *brahma* (prayer or God Brahmā) may be killed, that Vāk stands occupying all worlds and that her body touches heaven, that it is beyond heaven and the earth, that Vāk stands so vast by its greatness'. Vāk becomes the principle of all energy. According to the Nighaṇṭu (I. 11), menā, gnāḥ and śacī are three of the 57 words meaning 'Vāk'. In Tai. S. V. 1. 7. 2 the metres are called 'gnās'. Ṛg. I. 164. 41 is an enigmatic description of Vāk explained in Nirukta XI. 40. It should be noticed that, just as Devī or Śakti is associated with Śiva in later literature, so are Indrāṇī, Varuṇānī, Agnāyī, Rodasī associated with Indra, Varuṇa, Agni and Maruts respectively as wives. 'I invoke Indrāṇī,[1678] Varuṇānī and Agnāyī for my welfare and for drinking Soma'; 'May the women, the wives of gods, partake of the offering, viz. Indrāṇī, Agnāyī, the brilliant (wife) of the Aśvins, Rodasī; may Varuṇānī listen (to our laud); may the goddesses partake (of offerings) at the time (appropriate) for women'. It must be said, however, that these goddesses (devīḥ) play a very subordinate part in the Ṛgveda. No direct connection can be traced between these Vedic goddesses and the later conception of Devī or Śakti. Indrāṇī is invoked for protection in Ṛg. I. 22. 12, II. 32. 8, V. 46. 8, X. 86. 11-12. In Ṛg. V. 46. 8 Indrāṇī and three others are called Devapatnīs and 'gnās'. In Ṛg. I. 61. 8 it is said that the gnās, the wives of gods, wove, when Indra struck the demon Ahi, a song of worship. The word 'gnā' occurs 20 times in the Ṛg. in the nominative, objective, instrumental and locative and is an Indo-European word for wife (Greek has it). Vide Nir III. 21 where 'menā' and 'gnā' occur. In the Kenopaniṣad Umā Haimavatī (daughter of Himavat) tells of *Brahma* to the gods Agni, Vāyu and Indra (III. 12). In the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad it is said 'they (brahmavādins) endowed with meditation and Yoga saw Śakti (power) abiding as non-different from God and concealed (from com-

---

1678. इन्द्राणीमुप ह्वये वरुणानीं स्वस्तये। अग्नायीं सोमपीतये। ऋ. I. 22. 12; उत ग्ना व्यन्तु देवपत्नीरिन्द्राण्यग्नाय्यश्विनी राट्। आ रोदसी वरुणानी शृणोतु व्यन्तु देवीर्य ऋतुर्जनीनाम्॥ ऋ. V. 46. 8. सूर्या is said to be the wife of Aśvins in Ṛg. X. 85. 8–9; यास्क explains Ṛg. V. 146. 8 in निरुक्त XII. 46 and holds रोदसी as the wife of रुद्र; in. Ṛg. V. 56. 8 the Maruts are said to have 'Rodasī' on their chariot; in Ṛg. V. 61.4 the Maruts are said to have a beautiful wife; in VI. 50.5 Rodasī is called devī and is said to be mixed up with Maruts. In Ṛg. I. 167.4 and VI. 66.6 Rodasī is connected with Maruts.

prehension) by its own attributes (or by sattva, rajas and tamas).' The same Upaniṣad (in VI. 8) speaks of *Brahma* as possessing the highest Śakti[1679] in various forms and this text is quoted by Śaṅkarācārya on Vedāntasūtra II. 1. 24. In the *bhāṣya* on Vedāntasūtra II. 1. 30 and in the sūtra itself *Brahma* is said to be endowed with all powers. Vide also Śvetāśva. IV. 1. The Nārāyaṇopaniṣad contains an invocation of Durgā-devī[1680] 'I approach as a refuge the blazing goddess Durgā, brilliant like fire, luminous owing to *tapas*, that is resorted to for (yielding) the rewards of religious actions; O goddess possessed of excellent might! adoration to your power'. Rāghavabhaṭṭa[1681] avers that Tantra cult is based on Śruti as can be seen from the Upaniṣads called Rāmapūrvottara-tāpanīya and Nṛsimhapūrvottara-tāpanīya. Similarly, Bhāskararāya in his commentary Setubandha on Vāmakeśvaratantra mentions several Upaniṣads as treating in detail of the bhakti of Mahātripura-sundarī and interprets Ṛg. V. 47. 4 'catvari īm' as referring to Kādividyā. But all these Upaniṣads seem to be purposely composed to bolster up the *tantras* that had come to be looked down upon and they

---

1679. ते ध्यानयोगानुगता अपश्यन्देवात्मशक्तिं स्वगुणैर्निगूढाम्। श्वेताश्व० I. 3; परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च॥ श्वेताश्व० VI. 8; सर्वोपेता च तद्दर्शनात्। वेदान्तसूत्र II. 1. 30, on which शङ्कर says 'एकस्यापि ब्रह्मणो विचित्रशक्तियोगादुपपद्यते विचित्रो विकारप्रपञ्च इति।': But this is entirely different from the later Śākta doctrines. Here Brahma is said to be endowed with various Śaktis (not one), white Śakti among Śāktas is the female principle that is supreme. It is possible that such a vedānta doctrine of śakti might have suggested the later all-engrossing power of Śakti as the only deity or principle

1680. तामग्निवर्णां तपसा ज्वलन्तीं वैरोचनीं कर्मफलेषु जुष्टाम्। दुर्गां देवीं शरणमहं प्रपद्ये सुतरसि तरसे नमः। नारायणोपनिषद् 2. 1.

1681. श्रुतिमूलकता तु रामपूर्वोत्तरतापनीय-नृसिंहपूर्वोत्तरतापनीय-सौराष्टाक्षर-शैवपञ्चाक्षरात्मिका च साक्षाच्छ्रुतिरुपलभ्यत एव। राघवभट्ट on शारदातिलक p. 2; श्रीमहात्रिपुरसुन्दर्याश्च गौणीं भक्तिं सेतिकर्तव्यताकां निरूपयितुमैदंपर्येण सुन्दरीतापनीपञ्चकं भावनोपनिषत्कौलोपनिषद्-गुह्योपनिषन्महोपनिषच्चेत्यादयो वेदशिरोभागाः प्रवृत्ताः। सेतुबन्ध on वामकेश्वरतन्त्र p. 4; तथा च बह्वृचैराम्नायते-चत्वार ईं बिभ्रति...अस्मान्-इति। अत्र हि कादिविद्याया ईकारचतुष्टयवत्त्वविशेषणद्वारोद्धारः कृतः। सेतुबन्ध p. 17. In शाक्तोपनिषद्, edited with the com. of उपनिषद्ब्रह्मयोगिन् by Pandit A. Mahadevaśāstri, Adyar, 1925, are printed त्रिपुरा, त्रिपुरातापिनी, देवी, बह्वृच, भावना, सरस्वतीरहस्य, सीता, सौभाग्यलक्ष्मी (the भावनोपनिषद् occurring on pp 68–73). In the बह्वृचोपनिषद् (on p. 62) occurs the passage 'सैषा परा शक्तिः सैषा शाम्भवी विद्या कादिविद्येति वा हादिविद्येति वा सादिविद्येति वा रहस्यमोमों वाचि प्रतिष्ठा।.' The com. explains: श्रीमत्पञ्चदशाक्षरीमविभक्ता क ए ई ल ह्रीं-प्रथमखण्डात्मना कादिविद्येति वा-ह स क ह ल ह्रीं-इति द्वितीयखण्डात्मना हादिविद्येति वा स क ल ह्रीं-इति सादिविद्या वा रहस्यम्।.

are mostly mentioned by late medievel writers like Rāghavabhaṭṭa and Bhāskararārya. There are two great hymns addressed to Durgā in the Mahābhārata,[1682] viz. in Virāṭaparva (chap. 6) by Yudhiṣṭhira and the other in Bhīṣmaparva (chap. 23) by Arjuna, but they are discarded as apocryphal in the Poona critical edition. The Gangadhara stone Inscription of Viśvavarman of 480 of the Mālava era (424 A.D.) refers to Mātṛs (Mother Goddesses) and Tantra.[1683] The Bṛ. S. 57. 56 mentions the groups of Mātṛs. The Vṛddha-Hārīta-smṛti recommends that the householder should not enter places of Śaiva, Bauddha, Skānda and Śākta[1684] cults. The Viṣṇupurāṇa[1685] (one of the earliest among extant Purāṇas) speaks of the whole world as that of Viṣṇu, who is the highest *Brahma* and is endowed with

---

1682. In JRAS for 1906 pp. 355–362 B. C. Majumdar endeavours to show that the two hymns to Durgā are late interpolations in the Mahābhārata, probably derived from practices of non-Aryan Śūdras in Oriya-speaking hill tribes of Sambalpur. But he forgets that apart from other sources Kālidāsa (not later than about 400 A. D.) speaks of Pārvatī as Umā, Aparṇā, Durgā, Gaurī, Bhavānī and Caṇḍī in his several works and also that Kālidāsa refers to the Ardhanārīśvara form of Śiva. In the last verse of the Śākuntala Kālidāsa speaks of Śiva as 'parigata-śaktiḥ' and thereby suggests that at least the germs of the later Śakti worship were not unknown in his times. Therefore, the worship of Durgā in her several aspects is older than 300 A. D. by at least a century or more; vide pp. 185–186 above.

1683. मातॄणां च प्रमुदितघनात्यर्थनिर्ह्रादिनीनां तन्त्रोद्भूत-प्रबलपवनोद्वर्तिताम्भोनिधीनाम्। in Gupta Inscription No 17 p. 72. The बृहत्संहिता 57. 56 provides rules about images of Mātṛs 'मातृगणः कर्तव्यः स्वनामदेवानुरूपकृतचिह्नः', the विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराण (in I. 226) mentions a large number of मातृs including काली and महाकाली (in all over 180). Vide a recent work on 'the Cult of the Mother Goddesses' by E. O. James (London, 1959), of which pp. 99–124 deal with India; 'Matsyendranātha and his Yoginī cult' by Dr. Karambelkar in I. H. Q. Vol. XXXI (for 1935) pp. 362–374, which show that Ādinātha (Śiva Himself) was the guru of Matsyendranātha, who was himself guru of *Gorakṣanātha, the former being called Luipa (in Tibet), one of the 84 Siddhas;* vide Cunningham's Archaeological Survey Report IX, for the temple of 64 Yoginīs at Bheraghat and 'Tāntrik cult in Epigraphs' by Mr. B. P. Desaī in J. O. R (Mad.), Vol. 19 pp. 285–288.

1684. शैवबौद्धस्कान्दशाक्तस्थानानि न विशेत् कचित्। वृद्धहारीतस्मृति XI. 143.

1685. एतत्सर्वमिदं विश्वं जगदेतच्चराचरम्। परब्रह्मस्वरूपस्य विष्णोः शक्तिसमन्वितम्। विष्णुपु V. 7. 60; सुरामांसोपहारैश्च भक्ष्यभोज्यैश्च पूजिता। नृणामशेषकामांस्त्वं प्रसन्ना संप्रदास्यसि॥ विष्णुपु. V. 1. 86. This verse occurs in ब्रह्मपुराण 181. 52 and the preceding three verses which contain the names of Durgā are the same in both.

Śakti, enumerates some of the names of Durgā as Āryā, Vedagarbhā, Ambikā, Bhadrā, Bhadra-kālī, Kṣemadā, Bhāgyadā and winds up by stating that when Durgā is worshipped with offerings of wine, flesh, various kinds of foods, she, being pleased, would fulfil all desires of men. In the Kādambarī of Bāṇabhaṭṭa there is a long description of the temple of Caṇḍikā at a few days' journey from Ujjayinī, where there was an old Draviḍa devotee, in which the following points deserve to be noted, viz. offerings of the heads of animals, lion as *vāhana*, the slaughter of Mahiṣāsura, the doctrines of Pāśupatas written down on small books of palm leaves containing jugglery, tantra and mantras, Durgā-stotra written on a piece of cloth, ruined temples of the Mātṛs and description of the Draviḍa devotee as knowing thousands of wonderful stories about Śrīparvata. Bāṇa describes at length what queen Vilāsavatī, pining for a son, began doing to placate all Gods viz. sleeping in the shrines of Caṇḍikā where *guggulu* was being incessantly burnt, taking auspicious baths on nights of dark 14th in public squares where magic circles had been drawn by great magicians, visiting temples of Mātṛs, wearing amulets inside which were pieces of birch leaves on which mantras had been written with yellow pigment, and, when delivery was near, her bed was rendered holy with various herbs, roots and yantras (figures or diagrams). In the Harṣacarita (III) there is a reference to magic circles and to human sacrifices in the description of the Śaiva ascetic Bhairavācārya who had all the Śaiva-saṁhitās by heart, who performed the *japa* of a mahāmantra called Mahākālahṛdaya a crore of times in a cemetery and wanted the help of Puṣpabhūti (an ancestor of Emperor Harṣa) for perfection in that mantra to be achieved by subduing a *vetāla* and who ultimately attained to the position of Vidyādhara and rose into the starry firmament. In the last Introductory verse of the Harṣacarita the Emperor Harṣa is, by means of puns, called the Śrīparvata in yielding all Siddhis (supernatural powers, or fulfilment) according to the wishes of all suppliants.[1686] These descriptions from the works of Bāṇa (first half of 7th century) show how even long before the 7th century A. D. the worship of Caṇḍī, with flesh and the Śākta or Tāntrik paraphernalia of mantras, siddhis, maṇḍalas and yantras had gripped the minds of all Indian people, great

---

1686. जयति ज्वलत्प्रतापज्वलनप्राकारकृतजगद्रक्षः। सकलप्रणयिमनोरथ-सिद्धिश्रीपर्वतो हर्षः॥ हर्षचरित 1. 21; सौदामिनी says in मालतीमाधव 'गुरुचर्या तपस्तन्त्रमन्त्रयोगाभियोगजाम्। इमामाक्षेपिणीं सिद्धिमातन्वतो शिवाय वः॥' IX.

and small, rich and poor. In the Mālatīmādhava (Act V) we have a gruesome picture of human sacrifice to Cāmuṇḍā. In the same drama Saudāminī is described as observing the vows of a Kāpālika on Śrīparvata and as having secured supernatural powers by means of mantras. Śrīparvata is mentioned as a holy place of Śiva and Devī in Vanaparva 85. 19-20. The Vāsavadattā of Subandhu (p. 87 of Hall's ed.) speaks of Śrīparvata as 'Sannihita-mallikārjunaḥ.' Later on a few passages from Sanskrit and Prakrit literature will be cited to show how the teaching of Tāntrik practices led to great moral debasement and revolting orgies in the name of religion.

The literature on Tantras was vast (vide 'Principles of Tantra' ed. by A. Avalon, part 1 pp. 390-392 for a long list of Tantras). Both Hindu and Buddhist writers composed numerous works on Tantra and a very large number of subjects came to be included in Tantra works. Buddhist and Hindu Tantras are alike in some respects but they differ in the topics discussed, philosophical doctrines and some religious principles and practices. Tāntra works were introduced into Tibet, Mongolia, China, Japan and South East Asia. Originals of many of the Sanskrit Tāntrik works are now not available, but the translations of some of them in Tibetan are available.[1687] It is aid that even now if proper search is made, three hundred works on Tantra may be discovered (vide Dr. B. Bhattacharya in vol. X. of Śrī Rāmavarmā Institute of Research at Cochin p. 81).

It is difficult to give a general definition of Tantras. The word 'Tantra' is derived usually from 'Tan' to spread and 'trai' (to save). 'It spreads (dilates upon) many matters including the tattvas and mantras and affords protection;

1687. The following works will convey some idea of Śākta doctrines and practices: R. G. Bhandarkars's 'Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism &c.' (in Collected Works, Vol. IV pp. 203-210); 'Sakti and Śākta' by Sir John Woodroffe (1920); 'Serpent Power' by Arthur Avalon (Sir John Woodroffe); 'the Śāktas' by E. A. Payne (Oxford University Press, 1933) 'Sakti or divine power' by Dr. Sudhendu Kumar Das (Calcutta University, 1945); 'Doctrine of Śakti in Indian Literature' by Dr. P. C Chakravarti (1940). Vide Prof. Bagchi's 'Studies in the Tantras' pp 1-3 for the introduction of four Tāntrik texts in Kambuja (Cambodia) about 800 A. D. named 'Śiraścheda, Vināśikha, Sammoha and Nayottara and 'Inscriptions from Kambuja' by Dr. R. C. Majumdar (Calcutta, 1953) pp. 362, 373-374 and JRAS for 1950 pp. 163-65 for relics of Śāktism in Moslem Malaya.

therefore it is called Tantra'.[1688] They can only be described but one matter is included in almost all of them, viz. the five 'Makāras'. Often they contain an amalgam of religion, philosophy, superstitious dogmas, rites, astronomy, astrology, medicine, prognostications. They resemble the Purāṇas in several respects. The Buddhists deified many important personages of Buddhism and took over in course of time certain Hindu deities like Gaṇeśa and Sarasvatī. Tantras are classified by comparatively later works into three groups, Viṣṇukrānta, Rathakrānta and Aśvakrānta and 64 Tantras are assigned to each of the three groups (vide Tāntrik Texts, vol. I. ed. by Arthur Avalon, Introduction pp. II–IV); but these numbers seem to be fictitious. The same Tantra is put in two classes by certain works. The Kulārṇava-tantra (III. 6-7) speaks of five *āmnāyas* (East, West, South, North and ūrdhva) as the paths to Mokṣa. The Paraśurāma-kalpasūtra[1689] I. 2 does the same. Besides, Tāntrik worshippers are divided into three classes viz. Śaiva, Śākta and Vaiṣṇava. Bagchi states ('Studies in Tantras' p. 3) that Tāntrik literature is classified into *Srotas* (which are three) *Pīṭha* and *Āmnāya*. The Saundaryalaharī, ascribed by some to the great Advaita teacher Śaṅkarācārya, refers to sixty-four Tantras (in verse 31 which begins 'catuṣṣaṣṭyā tantraiḥ' which, it is said therein, were declared by God Śaṅkara for deluding[1690] the world. Several Hindu and Buddhist Tantras

---

1688. तनोति विपुलानर्थान् तत्त्वमन्त्रसमन्वितान्। त्राणं च कुरुते यस्मात् तन्त्रमित्यभिधीयते ॥.

1689. भगवान् परमशिवभट्टारकः...भगवत्या भैरव्या स्वात्माभिन्नया पृष्टः पञ्चभिर्मुखैः पञ्चाम्नायान् परमार्थसारभूतान् प्रणिनाय। परशुरामकल्पसूत्र I. 2. There exist works that mention the mantras and *dhyānas* of the five āmnāyas; for example, D. C. ms. No. 394 of 1882–83 does so (cat. vol. XVI on Tantra mss, pp 339–340).

1690. The evidence for attributing the work Saundaryalaharī to the great ācārya is not strong. In H. P. Śāstri's Cat. of Palm-leaf mss. in Nepa Durbar Library p. LXII there is an entry for तारारहस्यवृत्तिका, a Tāntrī compilation by a Śaṅkarācārya of Gauḍadeśa. This would emphasize that caution is required in accepting works ascribed to Śaṅkarācārya as genuine works of the great Advaita teacher. Vide D. N. Bose on 'Tantras, their philosophy and occult secrets' pp 29–30 for the names of 64 tantras mentioned in the Vārāhī-tantra together with the verses therein and Saundaryalaharī (tr. pp. 117–120) for a list of 64 tantras and Bagchi's 'Studies in the Tantras' p. 5 for the names of tantras considered authoritative in the 8th century A.D. and even prior to it. The तन्त्रालोक of अभिनवगुप्त states that there are groups of ten, 18 and 64 Śaiva tantras 'दशाष्टादशवस्वष्टभिन्नं यच्छासनं विभोः।

(*Continued on next page*)

have been published and we have now a fair idea of what the numerous Tantras must have been like. Some of the published Hindu Tantras are Kulārṇava, Tantrasāra, Nityotsava, Paraśurāmakalpa-sūtra, Pārānandasūtra, Prapañcasāra, Mantra-mahodadhi of Mahīdhara, Mahānirvāṇatantra, Rudrayāmala, Vāmakeśvaratantra, Śāradātilaka (about 11th century A. D.). Besides, there are works like the Tantrāloka and Mālinīvijaya-vārtika of Abhinava-gupta of Kashmir Tāntrism. They stand somewhat apart from the works enumerated above. Among the published Buddhist tantras are; Advayavajrasaṅgraha, Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa, Guhayasamāja-tantra (probably 6th century A. D.), Jñānasiddhi of Indrabhūti (717 A. D.), Niṣpan-nayogāvali of Abhayākaragupta (composed between the last quarter of 11th and first of 12th century A. D.), Prajñopāya-viniścaya-siddhi of Anangavajra (about 705 A. D.), Ṣaṭ-cakra-nirūpaṇa (1577 A. D.), Sādhanamālā (containing 312 small works supposed to be from 3rd to 12th century A. D.). Of the Buddhist Tantras Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa and Guhyasamāja-tantra[1691] are the oldest according to Dr. B. Bhattacharya (Intro. p. XXXVIII. to Guhya-samājatantra). Most of the above works have been published by Arthur Avalon (Sir. John Woodroffe) and in the Gaikwad Oriental Series. Some of the Hindu Tantras contain sublime philosophical views derived from the Upaniṣads and the Gītā or from the Sāṅkhya and Yoga and the final goal according to them is *Mukti* (liberation from the

---

(*Continued from last page*)

तत्सारं त्रिकशास्त्रं हि तत्सारं मालिनीमतम् ॥ I. 18 (Kashmir S. series, Vol. XXII p. 35). The नित्याषोडशिकार्णव (a part of वामकेश्वरतन्त्र) names the 64 Tantras in verses 13–22 of the first विश्राम, but it includes eight Yāmalas among Tantras, while Dr. Bhattacharya (in 'Introduction to E. B. p. 52) tries to distinguish Āgamas and Yāmalas from Tantra and also in his Intro. to Sādhanamālā Vol. II. pp. XXI–XXII. The कौलावलीनिर्णय of ज्ञानानन्दगिरि (Tāntrik Texts, vol. XIV) enumerates numerous tantras including Yāmalas in I. 2–14 and names (I. 92–93) eight gurus.

1691. Dr. Bhattacharya in Intro. to Guhyasamāja p. XXXIV holds that Asaṅga is probably the author of the Guhyasamāja and therefore that work belongs to the 3rd or 4th century A, D. One has only to read the Mahā-yānaśūtrālaṅkāra of Asaṅga ed. by Sylvain Levi and compare its refined and correct Sanskrit with the rather barbarous Sanskrit of the Guhyasamāja to come to the conclusion that the latter is not Asaṅga's work. There is no evidence to prove that Guhyasamāja belongs to the 3rd or 4th century A.D. It is probably two or more centuries later than that; Bagchi ('Studies in Tantras' p. 41) is against identifying Asaṅga, the author of Sādhana No. 159, with the great teacher of Yogācāra,

cycle of births and deaths) for all men but to be secured by following the path laid down by the Tantras. As the number of published Hindu Tantras is considerable, reference will be made mainly to a few viz. Kulārṇava, Pārānandasūtra, Prapañcasāra, Māhānirvāṇatantra, Vāmakeśvaratantra (Ānan. ed.), Śakti-saṅgamatantra, Śāradātilaka and in the case of the Buddhist tantras to Āryamañjuśrīmūla-kalpa, Guhyasamājatantra, Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi, Jñānasiddhi, Sādhanamālā, Sekodde-śaṭīkā. The purpose of most Buddhist Tantras is to indicate a short path for attaining Buddha-hood through Yoga practices and they introduce the element of Śakti for Yogic practices and for securing miraculous powers (called *siddhis*). In the History of Dharmaśāstra not much need be said about Buddhist Tantras except for comparison and stress will have to be laid on the Hindu Tantras alone. The philosophical aspects of Tāntrik culture may be studied in the Paraśurāmakalpasūtra, the Vāmakeśvara-tantra, Tantrarāja, the works on Kashmir Śaivism, works of Bhāskararāya, Bhāvanopaniṣad. This last is a late work dignified with the title of Upaniṣad, as it deals with *bhāvanā* and summarises the Vāsanāpatala of Tantrarājatantra (vide Intro. to the latter p. 3). There are also Vaiṣṇava Tāntras like the Gautamīya-tantra (D. C. ms. No. 1120 of 1886–1892) and Kramadīpikā of Keśava (who was a successor of Nimbārka) with the commentary of Govinda Vidyāvinoda (published in the Chowkhamba S. series), which are not referred to in this work from considerations of space. Vide Agnipurāṇa 39. 1–7 for the names of twenty-five Vaiṣṇava Tantras dealing with the establishment of Viṣṇu image and other matters and Māheśvara-tantra 26. 16–20.

The Hindu tantras which are supposed to have embodied dia-logues between Śiva and Devī or Skanda or Bhairava and rarely others as in Dattātreyatantra (D. C. ms. No. 962 of 1887–91) endeavour to show that they base themselves on the Vedas, Āgamas, Smṛtis and Purāṇas, that there is an easier and quicker way to the final goal of mokṣa and they often quote Vedic verses. For example, in the Kulārṇava, Śiva says to Devī 'I churned the great ocean of Vedas and Āgamas with the churning handle of (correct) knowledge. I knew the essence of these and took out the Kuladharma,[1692] that the Kaulaśāstras are autho-

1692. मथित्वा ज्ञानदण्डेन वेदागममहार्णवम्। सारज्ञेन मया देवि कुलधर्मः समुद्धृतः॥ कुलार्णव० II. 10; the परानन्दसूत्र III. 64 is almost the same 'मथित्वा ज्ञानमन्थेन

(*Continued on next page*)

ritative like Vedic texts and should not be nullified by ratiocination.' The same Tantra further asserts 'one who has studied the four Vedas but is ignorant of Kuladharma is inferior to a *cāṇḍāla*, while a cāṇḍāla who knows Kuladharmas is superior to a brāhmaṇa. If all dharmas such as sacrifices, pilgrimages and vratas are put on one side and Kuladharma on another side, Kaula (dharma) is superior.'[1693] It is, therefore necessary to understand what is meant by Kula or Kauladharma. The Guhya-samāja[1694] states that Guhya means the three viz. body, speech and mind and 'samāja' means 'coming together', that Kula may comprehend five matters or three or 101 and that Guhya (as defined) is *trikula*.' God Śaṅkara[1695] declared five tattvas, viz. wine, flesh, fish, mudrā (hand and finger poses or the woman helper of a yogin) and sexual intercourse, that are acts that become the means for the attainment of the position of a *vīra* and that the mantra of Śakti does not confer perfection unless one follows the practices of Kula; therefore a person

---

(*Continued from last page*)

वेदागममहार्णवम्। परानन्दमतं शुद्धं रसज्ञेन मयोद्धृतम्।। इति' (p. 7); 'कुलशास्त्राणि सर्वाणि मयैवोक्तानि पार्वति। प्रमाणानि न सन्देहो न हन्तव्यानि हेतुभिः।। देवताभ्यः पितृभ्यश्च मधुवाता ऋतायते। स्वादिष्ठया मदिष्ठया क्षीरं सर्पिर्मधूदकम्। हिरण्यपात्राः स्वाविश्च अबध्नन् पुरुषं पशुम्। दीक्षामुपेयादित्याद्याः प्रमाणं श्रुतयः प्रिये।। कुलार्णव II. 139–141. देवताभ्यः पितृभ्यश्च is वायुपु. 74. 15, मधु...यते is Ṛg. I. 90. 6, स्वादि...ष्ठया is Ṛg. IX. 1. 1, क्षीरं...दकम् is Ṛg. IX. 67, 32; हिरण्यपात्राः is in Ṛg. IX. 86. 43. Most of the Vedic references are cleverly chosen to suggest sweet wine and flesh.

1693. एकतः सकला धर्मा यज्ञतीर्थव्रतादयः। एकतः कुलधर्मश्च तत्र कौलोऽधिकः प्रिये॥ चतुर्वेदी कुलाज्ञानी श्वपचादधमः प्रिये। श्वपचोऽपि कुलज्ञानी ब्राह्मणादतिरिच्यते॥ कुलार्णवतन्त्र II. 11 and 67. Vide महानिर्वाणतन्त्र IV. 42 for almost the same words.

1694. त्रिविधं कायवाक्चित्तं गुह्यमित्यभिधीयते। समाजं मीलनं प्रोक्तं सर्वबुद्धाभिधानकम्॥ गुह्यसमाज 18th पटल p. 152; पञ्चकं त्रिकुलं चैव स्वभावैकशतं कुलम्।... तत्त्वं पञ्चकुलं प्रोक्तं त्रिकुलं गुह्यमुच्यते। ibid. p. 153.

1695. वीरसाधनकर्माणि पञ्चतत्त्वोदितानि च। मद्यं मांसं तथा मत्स्यमुद्रामैथुनमेव च। एतानि पञ्च तत्त्वानि त्वया प्रोक्तानि शङ्कर। महानिर्वाण I. 57; साधकs are of three kinds पशु, वीर and दिव्य. Vide शक्तिसङ्गमतन्त्र, कालीखण्ड VI. 21, महानिर्वाण I. 51 and 55, IV. 18–19, कौलावलीनिर्णय VII. 186. कुलाचारं विना देवि शक्तिमन्त्रो न सिद्धिदः। तस्मात्कुलाचाररतः साधयेच्छक्तिसाधनम्। मद्यं मांसं तथा मत्स्यं मुद्रा मैथुनमेव च। शक्तिपूजाविधावाद्ये पञ्चतत्त्वं प्रकीर्तितम्॥ महानिर्वाण॰ V. 21–22. आद्ये is vocative of आद्या applied to शक्ति, the spouse of शिव. The कौलावलीनिर्णय states चण्डिकां पूजयेद्यस्तु विना पञ्चमकारकैः। चत्वारि तस्य नश्यन्ति आयुर्विद्या यशो धनम्॥ मद्यं मांसं...मैथुनमेव च।... मकारपञ्चकं देवि देवताप्रीतिदायकम्॥...विना पञ्चोपचारं हि देवीपूजां करोति यः। योगिनीनां भवेद्भक्ष्यः पापं चैव पदे पदे॥ IV. 24–28; besides, कौलावलीनिर्णय II. 101–105 are more striking: संस्थाप्य वामभागे तु शक्तिं स्वामिपरायणाम्।...विना शक्त्या तु या पूजा विफला नात्र संशयः। तस्माच्छक्तियुतो धीरो भवेच्च यत्नपूर्वकम्। या शक्तिः सा महादेवी हररूपस्तु साधकः। अन्योन्यचिन्तनाच्चैव देवत्वमुपजायते।...शक्तिं विनापि पूजायां नाधिकारी भवेत्तदा॥.

should be devoted to the Kula practices whereby he would attain to the sādhanā of Śakti; wine, flesh, fish, mudrā and sexual intercourse—these are declared to be the five tattvas in the procedure of the worship of Śakti. In another place the Mahānirvāṇa[1696] says that the individual soul, *prakṛti*, space, time, *ākāśa*, earth, water, fire and Vāyu–these are called 'Kula' and that way of life whereby one looks upon all these as *brahma* without distinction is called Kulācāra, that confers the four goals viz. dharma, artha, kāma and mokṣa. The Śaktisaṅgama-tantra states that Kula means the *upāsakas* (worshippers)[1697] of Kālī. The Kulārṇava states 'Kula means gotra and that springs from Śakti and Śiva; that man is called Kaulika who knows that mokṣa is secured from that (i. e. Śakti and Śiva). Śiva is called 'Akula' and Śakti is called 'Kula'; those who contemplate on Kula and Akula are the wise kaulikas." Various other definitions are given in Guhyasamāja (Ist paṭala p. 6), in the Preface p. VIII of the Śaktisaṅgama-tantra, Tārākhaṇḍa But the same Tantra clinches the matter by declaring that "Śakti is known as *Kula*; her worship and the like are described; that should be known as 'Kulācāra', which is difficult of attainment even for gods. Worship, done with these alone viz. wine, flesh, fish, mudrā and sexual intercourse, is known as Kulācāra." The Pārānanda-sūtra[1698] provides that the highest self is one,

---

1696. जीवः प्रकृतितत्त्वं च दिक्कालाकाशमेव च। क्षित्यप्तेजोवायवश्च कुलमित्यभिधीयते। ब्रह्मबुद्ध्या निर्विकल्पमेतेष्वाचरणं च यत्। कुलाचारः स एवाद्ये धर्मकामार्थमोक्षदः॥ महानिर्वाण° VII. 97–98. In VII. 109–110 it identifies the five तत्त्व, मद्य, मांस, मत्स्य, मुद्रा and मैथुन with the five elements viz. तेजः (अग्नि), पवन, आपः, पृथिवी and वियत्.

1697. श्रीकाल्युपासका ये च तत्कुलं परिकीर्तितम्। तेषां समूहो देवेशि कुलं सङ्कीर्तितं मया॥ शक्तिसङ्गम, कालीखण्ड chap. 3. 32; मद्यं मांसं तथा मत्स्यं मुद्रा मैथुनमेव च। एभिरेव कृता पूजा कुलाचारः प्रकीर्तितः॥ शक्तिसङ्गम°, ताराखण्ड, 36th पटल, verses 18–20; कुलं गोत्रं समाख्यातं तच्च शक्तिशिवोद्भवम्। येन मोक्ष इति ज्ञानं कौलिकः सोऽभिधीयते॥ अकुलं शिव इत्युक्तं कुलं शक्तिः प्रकीर्तिता। कुलाकुलानुसन्धाननिपुणाः कौलिकाः प्रिये॥ कुलार्णव 17. 26–27. The पञ्चमकार-शोधनविधि (ms. D. C. No. 994 of 1891–95 folio 13 b) states 'मद्य...मैथुनमेव च। भाग्यहीना (नैः?) न लभ्यन्ते मकाराः पञ्च दुर्लभाः॥'.

1698. एकः परमात्मा। ईश्वराः सप्त। असंख्या जीवाः। ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवसूर्यगणेशशक्तिभैरवाश्चेश्वराः। पारानन्दे मते त्रयो मार्गाः। दक्षिणः। वामः। उत्तरः। तथैव गाथामुदाहरन्ति। दक्षिणादुत्तमं वामं वामादुत्तरमुत्तमम्। उत्तरादुत्तमं किंचिन्नैव ब्रह्माण्डमण्डले। वामाचारो द्विप्रकारो मध्यमोत्तमभेदेन। मद्यमैथुनमुद्राभिर्युक्तोऽसावुत्तमः स्मृत इति। मद्यमांसमत्स्यमुद्रामैथुनैर्युक्तो मध्यमः। पारानन्दसूत्र (G. O. S.) pp 1–3, 13; compare कुलार्णवतन्त्र II. 7–8 'वैष्णवादुत्तमं शैवं शैवाद् दक्षिणमुत्तमम्। दक्षिणादुत्तमं वामं वामात् सिद्धान्तमुत्तमम्। सिद्धान्तादुत्तमं कौलं कौलात्परतरं नहि'॥. वामाचार was possibly so called because woman (वामा) played an important part in it or it was secretly practised (which is a crooked way.)

that there are seven Lords (Īśvara) viz. Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Sūrya, Gaṇeśa, Śakti and Bhairava, that individual souls are countless, that there are three *mārgas* (paths) viz. Dakṣiṇa, Vāma and Uttara, each succeeding one being superior to each preceding one, that Dakṣiṇa-mārga is the one declared in the Veda, smṛtis and purāṇas, that the Vāma (way) is declared by the Veda and Āgamas, while the third (Uttara) is the one declared by the words of the Veda and of the Guru and that the Guruvākya is that of one's guru who is himself *Jīvan-mukta* and who gives instruction as to a mantra. That sūtra further provides that the Vāmācāra is of two kinds, *madhyama* (middling) and *uttama* (best), that uttama is the one which is concerned with wine, sexual intercourse and hand poses, while madhyama is one where all five, wine, flesh, fish, mudrā and *maithuna* are resorted to. It should be noticed that the Tantras themselves designate the use of five makāras in worship as Vāmācāra and not their orthodox partisans of Yoga, as Heinrich Zimmer alleges in 'The art of Indian Asia' vol. I. p 130. Pārānandasūtra[1699] prescribes that the disciple has to undergo *dīkṣā* (consecration) from a qualified guru, who instructs the disciple as to the mantra, who holds a mouthful of water in his own mouth and passes it into the mouth of the disciple that accepts the mantra while he gulps down the water. This procedure applies if the guru is a brāhmaṇa, but if the guru is a kṣatriya he should recite the mantra in the right ear of the disciple. The Tantrarāja-tantra provides that the guru should wait for 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 years according as the intending disciple belongs to the four varṇas or to a mixed caste, should test his qualities and devotion and then communicate to him the mantra; otherwise, both guru and disciple would come to grief (Tāntrik Texts, vol. VIII. II. 37–38). Most works on Tantra provide that the knowledge conveyed by the guru and worship with five *makāras* must be kept secret and if made public falling in hell is the result. Vide Paraśurāma-kalpasūtra I. 12 and Śaktisaṅgama-tantra.[1700] After undergoing dīkṣā and receiving the mantra the disciple has to follow the orders

---

1699. प्रत्यङ्मुख उदङ्मुखं शिष्यं तदिष्टमन्त्रमुपदिशेत्। मन्त्रं ग्राहयित्वा शुक्रजलगण्डूषं धृत्वा मन्त्रं जप्त्वा शिष्यमुखे निक्षिपेत्। निगिरन्नेव शिष्यो मन्त्रं गृह्णीयात्। एष ब्राह्मणोपदेशक्रमः। क्षत्रश्चेन्मन्त्रं ग्राहयित्वोपदिशेद् दक्षिणे कर्णे। परानन्दसूत्र p. 5 sūtras 12–16.

1700. आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो रूपं तच्च देहव्यवस्थितम्। तस्याभिव्यञ्जकाः पञ्च मकाराः, तैरर्चनं गुप्त्या, प्राकट्यान्निरयः। परशुरामकल्पसूत्र I. 12; वेदशास्त्रपुराणानि स्पष्टा वेश्याङ्गना इव: इयं तु शाम्भवी विद्या गुप्ता कुलवधूरिव॥ सुगुप्तं कौलिकाचारमनुगृह्णन्ति देवताः। प्राकट्यात्सिद्धिं प्रयच्छन्ति नाशयन्ति प्रकाशने॥ शक्तिसङ्गम, तारा० 36. 24–25.

of the guru till the former has a vision of the deity.[1701] Guru is higher than all other men, mantra is higher than guru, the deity is higher than the mantra and the highest self is higher than the *devatā.* In order to attain *siddhis* the guru is to be served by disciples with devotion in all ways. There is only one way viz. bhakti (devotion) for those (disciples) that long for worldly pleasures, heaven or mokṣa, as the Śruti says 'there is no other way'. Jīvan-mukti[1702] means 'to have a vision of the Deity worshipped' and 'one who is liberated, though living, is not tainted by his acts, whether meritorious or otherwise'. This doctrine closely follows what is said in some of the Upaniṣads about the man who has realised *brahma* that 'he shakes off *puṇya* and *pāpa* and having cast aside the body he reaches the world of *brahma*; he does not return i. e. he never again undergoes *saṁsāra*'. One should strive for that stage. Therefore one who has obtained correct knowledge should become a *bhakta* (devotee). All these, viz. one in distress, the seeker after knowledge, one who seeks some desired object and one who has obtained correct knowledge, are noble, but the man, who has knowledge about God, when he becomes a devotee, reaches the world of the Highest Self, as the Vedic words say 'one who knows brahma reaches the Highest'. With all this sublime philosophy as the background the Pārānandasūtra frankly provides that the guru, after completing the worship up to the offering of a handful of flowers and having offered into fire some food, should make a collection of *makāras,* should again come to the place for worshipping the Deity and offer food into fire, should hand over to the neophyte a bowl for drinking wine,

---

1701. मन्त्रदीक्षातः प्राग्देवतासाक्षात्कारादुर्वङ्गुश्राव्यो भवति। सर्वेभ्यः परो गुरुर्गुरोः परो मन्त्रो मन्त्रात्परा देवता देवतायाः परः परमात्मेति भावयेत्। भोगस्वर्गापवर्गकांक्षिणां भक्तिरेवैकः पन्था नान्यः पन्था इति श्रुतिः। पारानन्द॰ pp 6-7 sūtras 35, 38, 59. The श्वेताश्वतरोप॰ III. 8 and VI. 15 have 'तमेव विदित्वातिमृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय'. This half verse also occurs in वाज. सं. 31. 18.

1702. स्वोपास्यदर्शनं जीवन्मुक्तिः जीवन्मुक्तो न कर्मभिर्लिप्यते पुण्यैः पापैर्वा। न स पुनरावर्तते। न स भूयः संसारं सम्पद्यते। तस्मात्तद्दर्शने यतितव्यम्। ज्ञानी भक्तो भवेत्। आर्तजिज्ञासुर्थार्थिज्ञानिन उदारास्तत्रेशस्य ज्ञानी भक्त एव परमात्मलोकं प्राप्नोति ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परमिति शब्दात्। पारानन्द p. 9 sūtras 3-8. The words न च पुनरावर्तते occur in छा. उप. VIII. 15 at the end and the words 'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' are तै. उप. (ब्रह्मानन्दवल्ली) at the very beginning. The words आर्त...ज्ञानी भक्त एव are borrowed from गीता VII. 16-17 'चतुर्विधा भजन्ते...उदाराः सर्व एवैते ज्ञानी त्वात्मैव मे मतम्॥'. Compare मुण्डकोप॰ III. 1. 3 (तदा विद्वान् पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति); छा. उप. VIII. 13. महानिर्वाणतन्त्र IV. 22 (ब्रह्मज्ञाने समुत्पन्ने मेध्यामेध्यं न विद्यते॥ and VII. 94) (ब्रह्म...न्ने कृत्याकृत्यं न विद्यते॥).

mudrā, materials for dinner with condiments and a courtezan and should instruct the neophyte, that has accepted the three *makāras* (madya, mudrā and maithuna), as regards the kaula practices.[1703] Then the Pārānanda-sūtra devotes two pages (16–17) to the kauladharmas taught to the neophyte, from which a few striking passages may be cited. "A young[1704] courtezan is Śakti incarnate, is *brahma*; women are gods and the very life-breath and are ornaments (of the world); they should not be censured nor angered"; 'after worshipping the gods and gurus in the way laid down by the Veda and the Tantras a man does not incur sin if he drinks wine while remembering god or has sexual intercourse with a courtezan. He who partakes of wine and the rest merely for pleasing himself falls into a terrible hell. He who giving up the ordinances of śāstra acts as he pleases does not attain *siddhi* in this world, nor heaven nor the Highest goal (*mokṣa*). A worshipper should drink wine only up till his eyes do not begin to roll and up till his mind does not become unsteady; to drink beyond that stage is bestial'. The Pārānandasūtra (pp. 70–71) describes the procedure of a festival (Utsavavidhi) among Tāntrikas. The mantra is 'Īśvarātman, tava dāsoham', which may be given to even a cāṇḍāla or may be accepted from a cāṇḍāla. It is further provided that the followers of Vāma-mārga may employ the following mantras about the three makāras, that (the best among)

1703. गुरुः पुष्पाञ्जल्यन्तामर्चां विधाय हुत्वा हविः प्रतिपत्त्यगारं प्रविश्य मकारत्रय-सुरसीकृत्य पुनर्देवतागारमागत्य हुत्वा देवतां ससमस्तमण्डलामभ्यर्च्य नवशिष्यायालिपात्रं समुद्रं सव्यञ्जनभोजनसम्भारं सवेश्याकं प्रयच्छेत्।...गृहीतमकारत्रयं नव्यं शिष्यं कौलिक-धर्माननुपदिशेत्। परानन्द pp. 15–16, sūtras 56 and 63.

1704. स्वेच्छाकृतुमती शक्तिः साक्षाद् ब्रह्म न संशयः। तस्मात्तां पूजयेद्भक्त्या वस्त्रालङ्कार-भोजनैरिति॥ स्त्रियो देवाः स्त्रियः प्राणाः स्त्रिय एव हि भूषणम्। स्त्रीणां निन्दा न कर्तव्या न च ताः क्रोधयेदपि॥ इति। देवान् गुरूनसमभ्यर्च्य वेदतन्त्रोक्तवर्त्मना। देवं स्मरन् पिबन् मद्यं वेश्यां गच्छन्न दोषभाक्॥ इति। सेवेनैवात्मसुखार्थं यो मद्यादिकमशास्त्रतः। स याति नरकं घोरं नात्र कार्या विचारणा॥ यः शास्त्रविधिं ... परां गतिम्॥ इति। यावन्न चलते दृष्टिर्यावन्न चलते मनः। तावत्पानं प्रकुर्वीत पशुपानमितःपरम्। इति। जीवन्मुक्तः पिबेदेवमन्यथा पतितो भवेत्॥ इति। परानन्द० pp. 16–17 sūtras 64, 65, 74–76, 80–81. Extravagant praise is bestowed on women in several tantras such as in Śaktisaṅgama-tantra, Kālīkhaṇḍa 3. 142–144 and Tārākhaṇḍa 13. 43–50 and in कौलावलीनिर्णय X. 88. The half verse 'स्त्रियो...भूषणम्' occurs in शक्तिसङ्गमतन्त्र, ताराखण्ड 23. 10. The verse यः शास्त्र० is भगवद्गीता 16. 23. For यावन्न...परम् compare कुलार्णवतन्त्र VII. 97–98. The कुलार्णव states that every woman is born in the *kula* of the great Mother and so one should not beat a woman even with a flower even if she be guilty of a hundred misdeeds, one should not mind the faults of women and should make known only their good points (XI. 64–65). Vide also कौलावलीनिर्णय X. 66–69.

Vāmācāras should resort to. They are: 'I take this holy nectar, which is a medicine (antidote) for *saṁsāra*, which is a means of cutting off the snares by which the *paśu* (in man) is bound and which is declared by Bhairava' (this when taking the first i. e. wine); 'I take this mudrā which is 'ucchiṣṭa' of the Lord (i. e. which has been first offered to God), which destroys the torments of the heart, which produces joy and which[1705] is enriched with other food materials' (this when taking mudrā); 'I take this divine young woman who has drunk wine, that always makes the heart full of bliss and that brings about my sādhanā' (when taking one of the women that are brought together).

The Hindu Tantra works present two sides, one philosophical and spiritual, the other popular, practical and more or less magical, which relies on mantras, mudrās, maṇḍalas, *nyāsas*, *cakras* and *yantras* as physical means to realize one's identity with the Supreme Power or Energy by concentration and as conferring extraordinary powers on the devotee. This may be illustrated by reference to two typical tantras, the Śāradātilaka and the Mahānirvāṇa-tantra. The Mahānirvāṇa-tantra, though it speaks of the five makāras as means of *upāsanā* and though it states that when the great Tantra is understood, the Vedas, Purāṇas and śāstras are hardly[1706] of any use, puts forward the striking conception in IV. 34–47 that Parameśvara is one and to be described as *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda*, that He is one without a second, is beyond the *guṇas* and is to be known from the Vedānta texts. It further on says that the best mantra is 'om saccidekam brahma' (III. 14), that those who perform the upāsanā of the Highest Brahma do not require other means of worship (sādhanā); by sticking to this mantra man becomes *brahma*. In the 4th chap. however, the Mahāparinirvāṇa starts by saying that Durgā is the highest prakṛti of Paramātmā, she has various names such as Kālī, Bhuvaneśvarī, Bagalā, Bhairavī, Chhinnamastakā, that she is Sarasvatī, Lakṣmī and Śakti, that she assumes various forms for securing the purpose of her devotees and for the destruction of demons. In the Kaliyuga perfection cannot be attained without following *kula* practices, which lead

1705. Mudrā has not here the sense of 'hand and finger poses' but one of the meanings that will be noted under mudrā later.

1706. किं वेदैः किं पुराणैश्च किं शास्त्रैर्बहुभिः शिवे। विज्ञातेऽस्मिन्महातन्त्रे सर्वसिद्धीश्वरो भवेत्॥ महानिर्वाण II. 31.

to the knowledge of brahma and the man who possesses knowledge of brahma is a liberated soul, though living (he is *Jīvanmukta*). Then there is high praise (IV. 10 ff) of Devī who is spoken of as the primordial Śakti (ādyā paramā śakti) and all gods including Śiva himself derive their powers from this Highest Śakti. A rather astounding statement is made in[1707] the words 'as there was partaking of wine and the rest in Satya, Tretā and Dvāpara yugas, one should do the same in Kali-yuga, but in accordance with the *kula* way, and that Kali does not affect those who give to the truthful Yogin the five tattvas (wine &c.) sanctified according to the kula way'. Then a mantra of ten syllables is declared 'hrīm śrīm krīm parameśvari[1708] svāhā', by merely listening to which a man becomes *jīvanmukta*. Then by various combinations of the mystic syllables with Parameśvarī and Kālikā twelve mantras are produced (V. 18). But the mantras do not confer siddhi unless the kulācāra way is followed viz. the five tattvas 'madya' &c. are offered (V. 22-23). Then a Gāyatrī mantra is set out (V. 62-63) as 'adyāyai vidmahe Parameśvaryai dhīmahi। tan-naḥ Kālī pracodayāt॥', which is to be muttered thrice daily. The Sāṅkhya tattvas, Prakṛti, Mahat, Ahaṅkāra &c. are welded on to the worship of Śakti and the Vedic mantra 'Haṁsaḥ śuciṣad' (Ṛg. IV. 40. 5) with the Tāntrik *bīja* Hrīm (V. 197). The Tantra gives directions for the sanctification of flesh (V. 203-208, where Ṛg. I. 22. 20 'tadviṣṇoḥ paramam padam' is employed), of fish (V. 209-210) where the mantra 'Tryambakam' (Ṛg. VIII. 59. 12) is employed, of mudrā (V. 211-212 where the mantras 'Tad Viṣṇoḥ paramam' and 'tad-viprāso' Ṛg. I. 22. 20-21, are employed) to be offered to Devī. The Mahānirvāṇatantra

---

1707. सत्यत्रेताद्वापरेषु यथा मद्यादिसेवनम्। कलावपि तथा कुर्यात् कुलवर्त्मानुसारतः॥ ...कुलमार्गेण तत्त्वानि शोधितानि च योगिने। ये दद्युः सत्यवचसे न हि तान् बाधते कलिः। महानिर्वाण° IV. *56* and *60*. It may be stated here that in the two editions of the महानिर्वाण there is a difference of a few verses here and there.

1708. In the तन्त्र works the letters of the bījas in mantras are often indicated in a roundabout or mystic way. One example about the मायिक-बीज ह्रीं may be set out here. प्राणेशस्तैजसारूढो भेरुण्डा व्योमबिन्दुमान् (महानिर्वाण V. 10); here ह is प्राणेश, र is तैजस, ई is भेरुण्डा, व्योमबिन्दु is अनुस्वार and this gives the bīja ह्रीम्; क्रीं and श्रीं are described in नित्याषोडशिका° (I. 162-64) in a similar way. ह्रीं and श्रीं are respectively the बीजs of माया (or भुवनेश्वरी) and of लक्ष्मी. Vide मातृकानिघण्टु (Tāntrik Texts Vol. I. 5-22, pp 26-34 for बीजानिघण्टु, pp 35-45 for मातृकानिघण्टु i. e. for ओम् and letters of the alphabet from अ to क्ष). Every bīja mantra must have the *bindu* on it, as in Hrīm, Śrīm, Krīm &c. 'बिन्दुयोगं विना बीजत्वायोगात्' (सेतुबन्ध p *50* on नित्याषोडशिकार्णव).

(18th century) being composed after Śāktism had come into great ridicule and obloquy is rather sober.[1709] It says that women of good birth should simply smell wine and not drink it, while householder *sādhakas* should drink only as much as is contained in five cups, since by drinking too much men of good family incur the loss of *siddhi*, and should drink only so long as the wine quaffed does not make their eyes roll or does not make their mind confused. As to the last tattva (maithuna) the sādhaka was to confine himself to the woman he chooses as his Śakti (VI. 14) and if his wife is alive he is not to touch another woman with a vicious intent, otherwise he would go to hell.[1710] In keeping with its desire to present respectability along with tāntrik practices, the Mahānirvāṇa devotes chapter VIII. to the duties of *varṇas* and āśramas, the duties of the king, the duties of servants in general, provides[1711] that persons of all varṇas are to marry within the varṇa and dine with persons of the same varṇa, except when engaged in Bhairavī cakra and Tattva-cakra (VIII. 150), when men of all varṇas are like the best brāhmaṇas, and no consideration of the castes of the participants arises nor any question about *ucchiṣṭa*. It prescribes that no one has the adhikāra to engage in the performance of Tattvacakra unless he is a *sādhaka* endowed with knowledge of *brahma*. In that *cakra* the tattvas (wine and the others) should be collected and placed in front of the Devī, the mantra 'Hamsaḥ' (Ṛg. IV. 40. 5) should be recited over all tattvas and the tattvas should be offered to the Highest Self with the verse 'Brahmārpaṇam brahma havir' (Bhagvadgītā IV. 24 = Mahānirvāṇa VIII. 214)

1709. आलिपानं कुलस्त्रीणां गन्धस्वीकारलक्षणम्। साधकानां गृहस्थानां पञ्चपात्रं प्रकीर्तितम्॥ अतिपानात्कुलीनानां सिद्धिहानिः प्रजायते। यावन्न चालयेद्दृष्टिं यावन्न चालयेन्मनः। तावत्पानं प्रकुर्वीत पशुपानमतःपरम्॥ महानिर्वाण० VI. 194. The cup should be of gold or silver or of glass or of cocoanut shell but should not be more than five *tolakas* in capacity and not less than three 'पानपात्रं प्रकुर्वीत न पञ्चतोलकाधिकम्। तोलकत्रितयान्न्यूनं स्वार्णं राजतमेव च। अथवा काचजनितं नारिकेलोद्भवं च वा। महानिर्वाण VI. 187–188. For similar provisions about पानपात्र, compare कौलावलीनिर्णय VIII. 55–56.

1710. स्थितेषु स्वीयदारेषु स्त्रियमन्यां न संस्पृशेत्। दुष्टेन चेतसा विद्वानन्यथा नारकी भवेत्॥ महानिर्वाण० VIII. 40.

1711. संप्राप्ते भैरवीचक्रे सर्वे वर्णा द्विजोत्तमाः। निवृत्ते भैरवीचक्रे सर्वे वर्णाः पृथक् पृथक्॥ नात्र जातिविचारोऽस्ति नोच्छिष्टादिविवेचनम्। चक्रमध्ये गता वीरा मम रूपा नराख्यया॥ चक्राद्विनिःसृताः सर्वे स्वस्ववर्णाश्रमोदितान्। लोकयात्राप्रसिद्ध्यर्थं कुर्युः कर्म पृथक् पृथक्॥ महानिर्वाण० VIII. 179–180, 197. The verse प्रवृत्ते भैरवीचक्रे...पृथक् occurs also in कौलावलीनिर्णय VIII. 48–49. भैरवीचक्र and तत्त्वचक्र are described in महानिर्वाण० VIII. 154–176 and VIII. 204–219 respectively.

and all the sādhakas should engage in drinking and eating.[1712] Chap. IX enumerates and describes ten *saṁskāras* from garbhādhāna to marriage for members of the three varṇas and nine for śūdras (omitting *upanayana*), wherein Vedic mantras are prescribed as in the Dharmasūtras and smṛtis. One interesting item is what is called Śaiva marriage, which is of two kinds, one entered into according to the rules of *cakra* and the other lasting for life. It is further provided that in Śaiva marriage[1713] no question of *varṇa* or age arises and that if a man has children from a wife married in the *brāhma* form and also children of a Śaiva marriage, it is only the former that take as heirs and the latter are entitled only to food and raiment (IX. 261-264). Chapters X, XI, XII of the Mahānirvāṇa deal respectively with *śrāddhas*, *prāyaścittas* for sins and *vyavahāra*.

It is necessary now to turn to the Śāradātilaka which belongs to about the 11th century A. D. That work is divided into 25 *paṭalas* and contains over 4500 verses. It presents in the beginning a somewhat abstruse and involved philosophy. It says that Śiva is both *nirguṇa* and *saguṇa*, the former being different from Prakṛti, the latter being associated with Prakṛti. Then it describes the order of evolution and manifestation as follows :— From the Saguṇa Parameśvara described as "Sac-cidānanda-vibhava' Śakti[1714] proceeds; from the latter arises *nāda* (para) and from nāda arises *bindu* (para) which is divided into three viz. bindu (apara), nāda (apara) and *bīja*; the first is indentified with Śiva, bīja being Śakti and *nāda* being the coming together of the two (Śiva and Śakti). Śakti creates the worlds, she is *śabda-bhahma* (I. 56) and is called parāśakti (I. 52) and para-devatā (I. 57). She flashes like lightning in the ādhāra-cakra.[1715]

1712. ततो ब्राह्मेण मनुना समर्प्य परमात्मने। ब्रह्मज्ञैः साधकैः सार्धं विदध्यात्पान-भोजनम्॥ महानिर्वाण० VIII. 216. मनु is often used in the sense of मन्त्र ; vide कुलार्णव XII. 18, वृद्धहारीतस्मृति VI. 161, 163. मन्त्र and मनु are both derived from the same root '*man*' to think. The ब्राह्म-मनु is ओं सच्चिदेकं ब्रह्म.

1713. वयोवर्णविचारोऽत्र शैवोद्वाहे न विद्यते। ibid. IX. 279.

1714. Rāghavabhaṭṭa, the very learned commentator of the Śāradā-tilaka, who composed his commentary in Banaras in Vikrama year 1550 (1494 A. D.) explains that in the Sāṅkhya system Śakti is called Prakṛti, in Vedānta Māyā and in Śivatantras Śakti.

1715. Vide षट्चक्रनिरूपण (Tāntrik Texts, vol. II. ed. by Arthur Avalon) verses 4-49, Dakṣiṇā-mūrtisaṁhitā VII. 11-16 for cakras and "Serpent Power" (by A. Avalon, ed. of 1953) which contains an English translation

(*Continued on next page*)

Śakti assumes the form of Kuṇḍalinī in the human body. From Śambhu in the form of *bindu* arise in order Sadāśiva, Īśa, Rudra, Viṣṇu, Brahmā; from the avyakta *bindu* arise in order the mahat-tattva, ahaṅkāra and the other tattvas mentioned in the Sāṅkhya system. Śakti is all-pervading and yet more subtle than the subtlest, she is the Kuṇḍalinī coiled like a serpent and manifests herself in the form of the fifty letters of the Sanskrit alphabet (from 'a' to 'kṣa').

Before proceeding further some explanation of the six *cakras* which form an important constituent subject of several tantras is needed. There are said to be six cakras (centres) in the human body viz. Ādhāra or Mūlādhāra (at the base of the spine), Svādhiṣṭhāna (near the generative organ), Maṇipūra (near the navel), Anāhata (near the heart), Viśuddha (near throat), and Ājñā (between the brows). Besides these, there is Brahmarandhra figured as the pericarp of the thousand-petalled lotus

---

(Continued from last page)

of षट्चक्रनिरूपण in which plate I shows the positions of the six cakras also called lotuses (*padma*), plates II to VII facing pp. 356, 365, 370, 382, 392, 414 illustrate the six chakras from Mūlādhāra to Ājñā together with their colours, numbers of petals, letters, the devatās in each and other details. These are drawings used by the Yogis. Plate VIII facing p. 430 illustrates '*sahasrāra*'. Vide C. W. Leadbeater's work on 'the chakras' (Adyar, 1927), in which the author claims that the illustrations of the cakras represent them as they actually appear to those who can see them and on p. 56 he furnishes a table of the colours of the lotus petals as observed by Leadbeater and his friends, and as described in षट्चक्रनिरूपण, शिवसंहिता and गरुडपुराण. The Rudrayāmala (17th Paṭala, verse 10) speaks of Kuṇḍalī as 'Atharvavedacakrasthā Kuṇḍalī paradevatā', verses 21-24 speak of Kuṇḍalinī passing from Mūlādhāra-cakra and reaching the crown of the head that has the thousand-petalled lotus, that when united with Śiva he (sādhaka) drinks nectar there. Rudrayāmala (27. 58-70) dilates on the six cakras and the Sahasrāra together with the *dalas* (petals) and letters assigned to each. A stern warning has to be given that none should try to experiment about the cakras by reading books or try to rouse the Kuṇḍalinī except under the guidance of a real Master in Yoga, as otherwise very dangerous consequences would follow. Even as regards wrong methods of Prāṇāyāma and Dhāraṇā, the Vāyupurāṇa (chap. XI. 37-60) states that Yoga practices by ignorant men result in dullness of intelligence, deafness, dumbness, blindness, loss of memory, premature old age and disease and it specifies certain remedies to cure these defects. The present author knew a person who practised prāṇāyāma continuously for long periods becoming stone deaf, though otherwise he was strong and muscular, and an expert in ear diseases declared on examination that there was no possibility of his recovery by the methods of modern medical science.

within the crown of the head. The cakras are often indentified with the nerve plexuses of modern physiology, but the descriptions in Sanskrit works of the Kuṇḍalinī and the cakras are meant to refer not to the gross body but rather to what is situated in the subtle body that vanishes when a man dies. The idea of the relevant Sanskrit texts is that the Kuṇḍalinī Śakti ('Kuṇḍalin' means a serpent) is asleep in the Mūlādhāra-cakra coiled like a serpent and has to be roused by the practices of Yoga and deep meditation.[1716] The Śāradātilaka asks in an eloquent stanza the sādhaka to meditate upon the Kuṇḍalinī which when roused passes from the Mūlādhāra-cakra by means of the Suṣumnā-nāḍī (which is in the centre of the spinal column) through all the six cakras, unites with Śiva in the Sahasrāra (thousand-petalled) cakra and then returns to Mūlādhāra. Each of the six cakras is said to have a certain number of petals viz. 4, 6, 10, 12, 16, 2 (50 in all) in order from Mūlādhāra to Ājñā (vide Rudrayāmala, 17th Paṭala, verses 55-56). The letters of the alphabet also are 50 (from 'a' to 'kṣa') and they are assigned in groups to the six cakras as follows: ha and kṣa to Ājñā, 16 vowels to Viśuddha in the throat, letters ka to ṭha (12 in all) to Anāhata, letters Ḍa to Pha (10) to Maṇipūra, ba to la (6 in all) to Svādhiṣṭhāna, letters va to sa (4) to Mūlādhāra. Some tantras state the colour of each of the six cakras and identify them with the five elements and the mind. These speculations of the Yoga and Tantras are

---

1716. देवीभागवत XI. 1. 43 is: आधारे लिङ्गनाभिप्रकटितहृदये तालुमूले ललाटे द्वे पत्रे षोडशारे द्विदशदशदलद्वादशार्धे चतुष्के। नासान्ते बालमध्ये डफकठसहिते कण्ठदेशे स्वराणां हं क्षं तत्त्वार्थयुक्तं सकलदलगतं वर्णरूपं नमामि॥; that nectar flows over कुण्डलिनी when it reaches सहस्रार is stated in verse 47 of the same 'प्रकाशमानां प्रथमे प्रयाणे प्रतिप्रयाणेऽप्यमृतायमानाम्। अन्तः पदव्यामनुसञ्चरन्तीमानन्दरूपामबलां प्रपद्ये॥'; मूलोन्निद्रभुजङ्गराजमहिषीं यान्तीं सुषुम्नान्तरं भित्त्वाधारसमूहमाशु विलसत्सौदामिनीसन्निभाम्॥ व्योमाम्भोजगतेन्दुमण्डलगलद्दिव्यामृतौघप्लुतां सम्भाव्य स्वगृहं गतां पुनरिमां सञ्चिन्तयेत्कुण्डलीम्॥ शारदा° 25 65; vide *ibid*. 25. 78 for the वर्णs assigned to the six चक्रs. मूल and स्वगृह in (verse 65) mean the मूलाधारचक्र and भुजङ्गराजमहिषी means कुण्डलिनी. Vide षट्चक्रनिरूपण verse 53 also, for the stream of nectar flowing over कुण्डलिनी in सहस्रारपद्म. Vide मन्त्रमहोदधि IV. 19-25, ज्ञानार्णवतन्त्र (24. 45-54), महानिर्वाणतन्त्र V. 113-115, for the number of petals in cakras, their colours, the letters assigned to each and their identification with the five elements and mind and सौन्दर्यलहरी verse 9 'महीं मूलाधारे...सहस्रारे पद्मे सह रहसि पत्या विहरसे॥' for identifying the five elements and the mind with the six cakras. In 'Sarasvatībhavana Studies' Vol. II. pp. 83-92 Pandit Gopinath Kavirāja describes the system of *cakras* according to Gorakṣanātha. The रुद्रयामल (36. 6-168) sets out 1008 names of कुण्डलिनी, all of which begin with the letter क.

developments of the ancient Upaniṣad theories briefly noticed below.[1717]

Letters form words and words form mantras, that are the power incarnate of Śakti. Then the Śāradātilaka describes āsana, maṇḍapa, kuṇḍa, maṇḍala, pīṭhas (on which images of gods are to be placed), dīkṣā (initiation), prāṇapratiṣṭhā (vivifying images), production of sacrificial fire. The Śāradātilaka (I. 109 and V. 81–91), the Varivasyārahasya (II. 80), the Paraśurāmakalpasūtra (I. 4, 'Ṣaṭ-triṁśat tattvāni viśvam') and other Tāntrik and Āgamic works enumerate 36 tattvas (including those of the sāṅkhya system). From chap. VII. to XXIII mantras of different deities, their formation, use and results, abhiṣekas and mudrās are described. Yantras are dealt with in chap. XXIV and Yoga in chap. XXV. It must be said to the credit of the Śāradātilaka that it treats of only mantras and mudrās and hardly anywhere treats of the other makāras. The Śāradātilaka has been profusely quoted as an authoritative Tantra by medieval Dharmaśāstra writers like Govindānanda, Raghunandana, Kamalākara, Nīlakaṇṭha, Mitramiśra and orthers. In J. G. J. R. I. vol. III. pp. 97–108 M. M. Gopinath Kavirāja contributes a learned paper on nāda, bindu and kalā and takes great pains to elucidate these and hopes that his exposition will make the meaning of these words clear (p. 103). But the author feels grave doubts whether most readers will find the meanings clear.

Many tantras speak of the five makāras as the means of worshipping Devī, as enabling a man to possess miraculous

---

1717. From the times of the Upaniṣads the heart is likened to a lotu and it is said "There are hundred and one Nāḍis (arteries or veins) of the heart; *one of them penetrates the crown of the head ; moving upwards by it* a man (who is emancipated) reaches immortality." Vide 'अथ यदिदमस्मिन् ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तराकाशस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्तदन्वेष्टव्यं तद्वाव विजिज्ञासितव्यमिति। छा. उप. VIII. 1. 1. ; तदेष श्लोकः। शतं चैका हृदयस्य नाड्यस्तासां मूर्धानमभिनिःसृतैका। तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति विष्वङ्ङन्या उत्क्रमणे भवन्ति। छा. उप. VIII. 6. 6. The same verse (शतं चैका) is कठोप. VI. 16 and compare प्रश्नोप. III. 6 for a similar statement; compare वे. सू. III.2 7 'तदभावो नाडीषु तच्छ्रुतेरात्मनि च' and IV. 2.17; in the भाष्य on IV. 2. 17 शङ्कराचार्य quotes the verse 'शतं चैका' &c. The मिता. on या. III. 108–109 refers to इडा, पिङ्गला, सुषुम्ना and ब्रह्मरन्ध्र and the रुद्रयामल (VI. 49) speaks of ten nāḍis of which the three Iḍā &c. represent Soma, Sūrya and Agni. मैत्र्युपनिषद् VI. 21 is: अथान्यत्राप्युक्तम्। ऊर्ध्वगा नाडी सुषुम्नाख्या प्राणसञ्चारिणी ताल्वन्तर्विच्छिन्ना।. The word is written sometimes as सुषुम्णा. The बृह. उप. II. 1. 19 speaks of 72000 nāḍis that start towards Purītat from the heart and या. III. 108 also says the same.

powers and as leading to final liberation. The Kulārṇava states 'the great Bhairava has prescribed that in the Kaula system Siddhi (perfection) results from those very substances by (resorting to) which (ordinarily) men incur sin'. That means that the Kaula system eradicates poison by poison or, to employ modern terminology, its principles are like those of Homeopathy.[1718]

The Tantras seem to be not unaware that in prescribing the five *makāras* as leading to mukti (final liberation) they were playing with fire. The Kulārṇava itself remarks (II. 117–119 and 122) 'If by merely drinking wine a man were to attain siddhi (miraculous powers, perfection), then all wretched drunkards may attain siddhi. If, by merely eating meat a holy goal were to be secured then all meat-eaters in the world would be holy men. If by mere intercourse with a woman (called *śakti*) mokṣa was to result, then all men in the world may attain liberation. To follow the path (of Kula) is indeed more unattainable than walking on the edge of a sword, than clinging to a tiger's neck, than holding a serpent (in one's hand)'. The Kulārṇava prefaces the preceding dicta by the words 'Many, who are devoid of traditional knowledge and who profane (the śāstra) by false ideas, imagine that the Kaulika doctrine is this and that, relying on their (poor) intellect' (II. 116).

The Devībhāgavata provides (XI. 1. 25) that so much of tantra as is not opposed to the Veda is undoubtedly authoritative (vedāvirodhi cet tantram tat pramāṇam na saṁśayaḥ), but what is opposed to Veda is not authoritative.

There appears to have been great rivalry between the Hindu and Buddhist tantras. The Śaktisaṅgama-tantra, one of the most popular and most exhaustive works on tantra, states that Devī manifests herself for the destruction of Bauddha and other heretical sects, for the removal of the confusing admixture of

---

1718. यैरेव पतनं द्रव्यैः सिद्धिस्तैरेव चोदिता। श्रीकौलदर्शने चापि भैरवेण महात्मना। कुलार्णव V. 48; vide ज्ञानसिद्धि (Buddhist tantra) I. 15 'कर्मणा येन वै सत्त्वाः कल्पकोटिशतान्यपि। पच्यन्ते नरके घोरे तेन योगी विमुच्यते॥' and compare प्रज्ञोपाय॰ (Buddhist) V. p. 23 verses 24–25 'जनयित्रीं स्वसारं च स्वपुत्रीं भागिनेयिकाम्। कामयन् तत्त्वयोगेन लघु सिध्येत साधकः॥' (both works in 'Two vajrayāna texts,' G. O. S.). Bagchi in 'Studies in tantras' (pp 36–37) shows that according to some Tāntrik works the words जनयित्री, स्वसृ, भागिनेयी have esoteric meanings and not the ordinary meanings. But in the context in which they are employed in the two vajrayāna texts, it is rather difficult to hold that they are employed in any esoteric or symbolic sense.

different cults, for the establishment of the (true) cult, for the protection of what the brāhmaṇas stand for and for the perfect attainment of mantra-śāstra.[1719] The Bauddha tantras, on the other hand, were not slow to retaliate.

It would not be entirely out of place if a few words were devoted to the Bauddha Tantras, particularly of the Vajrayāna. It has already been shown above (pp. 943–44 note 1516) that all Buddhists, whether of the *hīnayāna* or *mahāyāna* type, were required to observe strict rules and regulations such as those of *pañcaśīlas* and of taking refuge with Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha and of daśaśīlas (for monks). The goal of nirvāṇa (particularly under Mahāyāna doctrines) could be reached only after a very long time or after several births. As luxuries viz. flesh, fish, wine and women had been banned, the general mass of the people and probably monks also were tired of the strict mode of life and long waiting for the goal. Buddhist Tantras like the Guhyasamāja (that belongs to the Vajrayāna school) provided an easy process by which liberation and even Buddhahood could be secured in a short time and even in[1720] one life and averred that Bodhisattvas and Buddhas attained the seat of *dharma* by enjoying all objects of pleasure as they[1721] pleased. The word Vajra means both 'diamond' and 'thunderbolt'. The first meaning appears to have been principally meant in the Guhyasamāja but the 2nd meaning also must have been sometimes intended. Vajra denotes anything which is hard like a diamond. In the Guhyasamājatantra the word Vajra, either singly or in compounds, occurs hundreds of times. Kāya (body), Vāk (speech) and citta (mind) are called 'trivajra' (Guhya, pp. 31, 35, 36, 43). Numerous other things[1722] are called 'vajra',

---

1719. आविर्भवति देवेशि दिव्यौघद्वारतः शिवे। बौद्धपाषण्डनाशार्थं संप्रदायार्थमेव च। संप्रदायसङ्कराणां विनाशार्थमिहेश्वरि। संप्रदायस्थापनार्थं ब्राह्मण्यरक्षणाय च। मन्त्रशास्त्रस्य सिद्ध्यर्थमाविर्भवति पार्वति। शक्तिसङ्गम०, कालीखण्ड I. 17–19.

1720. तदिहैव जन्मनि गुह्यसमाजाभिरतो बोधिसत्त्वः सर्वतथागतानां बुद्ध इति संख्यां गच्छति। गुह्यस० p. 144 ; vide ज्ञानसिद्धि I. 4 ये तु सत्त्वाः समारूढाः सर्वसङ्कल्पवर्जिताः। ते स्पृशन्ति परां बोधिं जन्मनीहैव साधकाः॥ and also प्रज्ञोपाय० V. 16.

1721. सर्वकामोपभोगैश्च सेव्यमानैर्यथेच्छतः। अनेन खलु योगेन लघु बुद्धत्वमाप्नुयात्॥ दुष्करैर्नियमैस्तीव्रैः सेव्यमानो न सिध्यति॥...बुद्धाश्च बोधिसत्त्वाश्च मन्त्रचर्याग्रचारिणः। प्राप्ता धर्मासनं श्रेष्ठं सर्वकामोपसेवनैः॥ गुह्यस. 7th पटल p. 27.

1722. Vide Winternitz's 'History of Indian Literature' (English tr.) vol. I. p 388 for the application of the word 'vajra' to many things. It may

(*Continued on next page*)

such as the *śūnya* (the Absolute of the Mādhyamaka school) and also Vijñāna (consciousness), which is the sole reality according to the Yogācāra school, and the Mahāsukha (Bliss) added by the Śāktas. It also means the male organ in the mystic language of Śāktas. Though the original Buddhist rules insisted on ahiṁsā, Guhyasamāja permitted several kinds of flesh, such as that of elephants, horses, dogs and even human[1723] flesh. Early Buddhism insisted upon truthfulness and continence (brahmacarya); vajrayāna, being an innovating revolt, allowed the killing of all animals, speaking untruth, intercourse with women (including even incest with the mother, sister[1724] and daughter) and appropriating wealth not donated by any one. This was called vajramārga (the path of vajra), which is said to have been the doctrine of all Buddhas.

The Prajñopāya (I. 20) describes the state reached by the Vajrayāna method as follows. 'It is neither duality nor non-duality, it is full of peace, beneficent, present everywhere, to be realised by one's own self, steady (unchanging), undisturbed and full of Prajñā (wisdom) and Upāya (activity with compas-

---

(Continued from last page)

be noted that the Jñānasiddhi II. 11 (Buddhist work) states 'स्त्रीन्द्रियं च यथा पद्मं वज्रं पुंसेन्द्रियं तथा॥'. शून्यता is called वज्र because it is दृढं सारमसौ(से?) शीर्यमच्छेद्याभेद्यलक्षणम्। अदाहि अविनाशि च शून्यता वज्रमुच्यते॥ अद्वयवज्रसंग्रह (G. O. S. pp. 23, 37). This is somewhat like the doctrine of Brahma and Ātman in the Bhagavadgītā II. 23-25 (नैनं छिन्दन्ति शस्त्राणि &c.). ज्ञानसिद्धि p. 76 explains: सर्वसत्त्वेषु महाकरुणाप्रमाणानुगतं बोधिचित्तं वज्र इत्यर्थः' i.e. वज्र and बोधिचित्त (Enlightenment) are synonymous. न द्वयं नाद्वयं शान्तं शिवं सर्वत्र संस्थितम्। प्रत्यात्मवेद्यमचलं प्रज्ञोपायमनाकुलम्॥ प्रज्ञोपाय° I. 20; प्रज्ञापारमिता सेव्या सर्वथा मुक्तिकांक्षिभिः।...ललनारूपमास्थाय सर्वत्रैव व्यवस्थिता। अतोर्थे वज्रनाथेन प्रोक्ता बाह्यार्थसम्भवा॥ प्रज्ञोपाय° V. 22-23.

1723. मांसाहारादिकृत्यार्थे महामांसं प्रकल्पयेत्।...हस्तिमांसं हयमांसं श्वानमांसं तथोत्तमम्। भक्षेदाहारकृत्यार्थं न चान्यत्तु विभक्षयेत्। प्रियो भवति बुद्धानां बोधिसत्त्वश्च धीमताम्। अनेन खलु योगेन लघु बुद्धत्वमाप्नुयात्। गुह्यसमाज° 6th पटल p. 26; vide ज्ञानसिद्धि of इन्द्रभूति I. 12-14 for similar verses, प्राणिनश्च त्वया घात्या वक्तव्यं च मृषा वचः। अदत्तं च त्वया ग्राह्यं सेवनं योषितामपि॥.

1924. अनेन वज्रमार्गेण वज्रसत्त्वान् प्रचोदयेत्। एषो हि सर्वबुद्धानां समयः परमशाश्वतः॥ गुह्यस°, 16th पटल p 120; ये परद्रव्याभिरता नित्यं कामरताश्च ये।...मातृभगिनीपुत्रीश्च कामयेद्यस्तु साधकः। स सिद्धिं विपुलां गच्छेत् महायानाग्रधर्मताम्। गुह्यस. 5th पटल p. 20; 'सर्वाङ्गकुत्सितायां वा न कुर्यादवमाननाम्। स्त्रियं सर्वकुलोत्पन्नां पूजयेद् वज्रधारिणीम्॥ चण्डालकुलसम्भूतां डोम्बिकां वा विशेषतः। जुगुप्सितकुलोत्पन्नां सेवयन् सिद्धिमाप्नुयात्। ज्ञानसिद्धि I. 80 and 82. Vide Dr. Guenther's exposition of this passage and of a similar one from Prajñopāya. V. 25 in 'Yuganaddha' pp. 106-109. Vide Dr. S. B. Das-Gupta in 'Introduction to tāntrik Buddhism' p. 114.

sion) and it further provides (V. 22-23) that 'by those who hanker after liberation perfection of wisdom must be sought (resorted to or adored) in all ways. This perfection of wisdom is everywhere present assuming the form of woman'. Prajñā was linked up with an intense state of emotion called Sukha or Mahāsukha (great bliss). "It being of the nature of endless bliss is designated mahāsukha; it is beneficent all round, most eminent and conduces to complete enlightenment' (Prajñopāya. I. 27) and 'this all Buddha knowledge which is by its nature to be experienced by one's inmost self is called Mahāsukha (great bliss) since it is the most eminent of all pleasures' (Jñānasiddhi VII. 3). The word Prajñā is feminine in gender and therefore some Vajrayāna writers identified Prajñā with woman; by erotic symbolism and far-fetched analogies the cult of woman was started.

Dr. H. V. Guenther has published a book styled 'Yuganaddha' propounding the Tāntrik view of life based only on Buddhist Tantras and endeavours to prove in that work (of about 190 pages) that the Buddhist Tāntrikas try to restore life in its entirety, which is neither an indulgence in passions nor a rejection and escape, but a complete reconciliation to the hard facts of life, that the sexual aspect of the Tantras is but the corrective against the one-sided intellectualism and rationalism of mere philosophy which is unable to cope with the problems of everyday life and that the symbol of Yuganaddha points to the unique harmony and interpenetration of masculinity and feminity, of blunt truth and symbolic truth, of intellect and humanity. It is not possible even to summarize this work or criticize it here. The core of the doctrine of the Vajrayāna tantras is found in the passages quoted in notes 1720-21, 1723-24. The argument is: according to these Tantras perception of wholeness is the most joyous of all human experiences and man's experience will not be full but only partial if he has no experience of feminity i. e. of everything female. He may experience feminity through all female members of his family. Therefore, it is not to be wondered at, says Dr. Guenther, that 'this experience so often has an incestuous character'. Then he offers (on pp. 106-112) a lengthy explanation of what he means which, the present author has to confess, is not quite clear to his moderate mental abilities. Dr. Guenther appears to be steeped in all the latest theories of modern psychologists like those of Freud and tries to expound that Buddhist authors of the 8th century A. D. like Anaṅgavajra and Indrabhūti had plumbed the depths of the

psychical life on the lines of modern psycho-analysis. Granting for a moment all that Dr. Guenther says about bi-sexuality, about sexual partnership being the best expression for the most intimate relation between two opposites, about woman being for the male a material object and a goddess, the present writer feels that one question appears to have been not satisfactorily answered or explained, viz. why did not the Buddhist Tāntrikas simply exhort the sādhaka to understand the emotions, view-points and value of woman as a mother, sister, wife, daughter or as a woman in general and why did they frequently and blatantly harp upon sexual intercourse of even an incestuous kind as a quick method of realizing the goal?

The Guhyasamāja-tantra puts forward a quick and short method for realising Buddhahood and for the attainment of miraculous powers (siddhis) through the processes of Yoga. The siddhis are said to be of two kinds, Sāmānya (ordinary,[1725] such as becoming invisible) and Uttama (highest i. e. attaining Buddhahood). Four means for securing ordinary *siddhis* are mentioned and they are called *Vajra-catuṣka*. It is further provided that the best *ṣiddhi* is acquired by the nectar of knowledge due to the six aṅgas[1726] of Yoga (and by no other way) viz. Pratyāhāra, Dhyāna, Prāṇāyāma, Dhāraṇā, Anusmṛti and Samādhi. It is worthy of note that the first three aṅgas of yoga mentioned in the Yogasūtra viz. *yama*, *niyama*[1727] and *āsana* are omitted and a new one, Anusmṛti, is added. Yama could not be included because to the Guhyasamāja it did not matter if the sādhaka ate flesh, or indulged in sexual intercourse or told lies, while in Yogasūtra *yamas* are *ahiṁsā*, *satya* (truthfulness), *asteya* (not appropriating anything that does not belong to one), *brahmacarya* (sexual purity) and *aparigraha* (non-acceptance of gifts). Niyamas could not be included because among the five

---

1725. अन्तर्धानादयः सिद्धाः (? सिद्धयः) सामान्या इति कीर्तिताः। सिद्धिरुत्तममित्याहुर्बुद्धत्वसाधनम्॥ चतुर्विधमुपायं तु बोधिवज्रेण वर्णितम्।...सेवाविधानं प्रथमं द्वितीयमुपसाधनम्। साधनं तु तृतीयं वै महासाधनं चतुर्थकम्॥ सामान्योत्तमभेदेन सेवा तु द्विविधा भवेत्। वज्रचतुष्केण सामान्यमुत्तमं ज्ञानामृतेन च॥ गुह्यसमाज. 18th पटल p. 162.

1726. उत्तमे ज्ञानामृते चैव कार्यं योगषडङ्गतः। सेवा षडङ्गयोगेन कृत्वा साधनमुत्तमम्। साधयेदन्यथा नैव जायते सिद्धिरुत्तमा। प्रत्याहारस्तथा ध्यानं प्राणायामोऽथ धारणा। अनुस्मृतिः समाधिश्च षडङ्गो योग उच्यते। गुह्यसमाज pp. 163. All these six are defined on pp. 163-164. अनुस्मृति is defined as 'स्थिरं तु वज्रमार्गेण स्फारयीत स्वधातुषु। विभाव्य षडङ्गस्मृत्या तदाकारं तु संस्मरेत्। अनुस्मृतिरिति ज्ञेया प्रतिभासोऽत्र जायते॥' गुह्यस० p. 164

1727. For यम and नियम vide note 1525 above and the eight aṅgas of योग are: यम-नियम-आसन-प्राणायाम-प्रत्याहार-धारणा-ध्यान-समाधयोऽष्टावङ्गानि। योगसूत्र II. 29

niyamas are svādhyāya (Veda study) and (Īśvarapraṇidhāna) devotion to or surrender to God. Many Bauddhas reviled the Veda and acknowledged no Supreme Deity. The Guhyasamāja introduced Yogic practices for quickly securing Buddhahood. The idea of allowing flesh and sexual intercourse seems to have been that the Yogin is to be indifferent as to what he does so long as he is striving for the goal of Buddhahood, for development of his psychic life and that he may disregard all social conventions and rules.[1728] Another innovation of the Vajrayāna was the introduction of *upāsanā* of Śakti for liberation through Yoga. The Guhya-samāja provides that if even after making efforts for six months, the sādhaka has no realisation, he may repeat his efforts for three times more and if even after that he has no enlightenment he should resort to Haṭhayoga and then he would attain correct knowledge through Yoga. A further innovation was the theory of the five Dhyāni-buddhas,[1729] emanating from the Bhagavān, who represent the five Skandhas or fundamental principles of which the whole creation is composed and each of whom was associated with a female Śakti. The teaching of the Guhyasamāja is that if psychical power and miraculous siddhis are to be developed females must be associated with those who undertake Yogic exercises to achieve their ends. Thus the prophecy of the founder of Buddhism pronounced, when yielding to the pressure and entreaties of his favourite disciple Ānanda for allowing women to be members of the *saṅgha* and to be nuns, that on account of this innovation his system would stand fast only for five hundred years, though otherwise it would have lasted for a thousand years, was literally fulfilled (vide Cullavagga

---

1728. भक्ष्याभक्ष्यविनिर्मुक्तः पेयापेयविवर्जितः। गम्यागम्यविनिर्मुक्तो भवेद्योगी समाहितः॥ ज्ञानसिद्धि I. 18; गम्यागम्याविसङ्कल्पं नात्र कुर्यात् कदाचन। मायोपमाद्वियोगेन भोक्तव्यं सर्वमेव हि॥ वज्रोपाय° p. 23 v. 29.

1729. Vide Dr. Bhattacharya's Introduction to Guhyasamāja-tantra p. XIX and his Intro. to B. E. pp. 32–33, 70, 80–81, 121, 128–130 for the theory of Dhyāni-buddhas, their śaktis, kulas, the meaning of kula &c. On p. 32 of B. E. Dr. Bhattacharya observes 'we have already mentioned that Buddhism was a challenge to and repudiation of earlier Brahmanism. It was now the part of Tāntrik Buddhism to challenge the authority of Buddha and repudiate the original Buddhism. All kinds of worldly enjoyments were forbidden (by Buddha), especially wine, women, fish, meat and exciting food. All these the Tāntrikas of the later age introduced into their religion and even went so far as to declare that without these emancipation was impossible'.

X. 1. 6 in Vinaya Texts, vol. III. S. B. E. XX. p. 325). If we accept 483 B. C. as the date of Buddha's Parinirvāṇa (as many scholars hold) or 477 B. C. (as A. Foucher holds) 500 years therefrom would bring us to the first century A. D. and it is clear that by a century or two after that time much of Buddha's teaching appears to have been almost completely swamped by doctrines of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna Tantras. By a strange irony of fate Buddha's 'dharma-cakra-pravartana' came to be transformed into 'adharma-cakra-pravartana' by many of his so-called followers of the Vajrayāna. In the Mahā-parinibbāna-sutta V. 23 (S. B. E. vol. XI. p. 91) the Buddha was very strict and warned bhikkhus not to see bhikkhunis, not to talk to them if they could not avoid seeing them, and to be wide awake if a nun talked to them. Buddha severely rebuked one of his disciples for showing his miraculous powers (vide p. 1037 and n. 1672 above), but Guhyasamāja and other Buddhist tantras make provision for endowing the sādhaka with miraculous powers, such as causing rainfall in case of drought (Guhyasamāja p. 84), killing an enemy by magical rites over an effigy of the enemy (*ibid.* p. 96). Besides, the Guhyasamāja knows the six cruel or terrible magic acts (called 'ṣaṭkarmāṇi'), viz. *Śānti* (rite for averting disease or black magic), *vaśīkaraṇa* (bewitching women and men and even gods), *stambhana* (stopping the movements or actions of others), *vidveṣaṇa* (creating enmity between two friends or two persons who love each other), *uccāṭana* (making a person or enemy flee from the country, town or village), *māraṇa* (killing or causing permanent injury to living beings). The Guhyasamāja mentions these six (putting 'ākarṣaṇa' for 'vidveṣaṇa') respectively at pp. 168, 165, 96, 87 (Ākarṣaṇa), 81, 130. Vide Sādhanamālā pp. 368–369 for the same and for the shape of maṇḍalas and times for each of the six cruel rites. Even the rather sober Śāradātilaka-tantra mentions these six (23. 122), defines them (23. 123–125), provides that Rati, Vāṇī (speech or Sarasvatī), Ramā, Jyeṣṭhā, Durgā and Kālī are respectively the six deities of these six cruel acts and must be worshipped at the commencement, that six periods of ten *ghaṭikās* from sunrise are respectively appropriate to these six and so also are certain seasons (23. 126–139). It is most astounding that the Prapañcasāra (23. 5) ascribed to the great advaita teacher Śaṅkarācārya describes at length a mantra called Trailokya-mohana for accomplishing the above six cruel acts.

Both Hindu and Buddhist Tantras[1730] lay great emphasis on the importance and qualifications of the *guru.* The Bauddha Tantras have the highest praise for the guru. The Jñānasiddhi (13. 9–12) prescribes high qualifications and the Prajñopāyaviniścaya-siddhi (III. 9–16) contains a grand eulogy of the guru, identifying him with Buddha and calling him omniscient and so on. The Advayasiddhi of Lakṣmīṅkarā (about 729 A. D.), who started the astounding doctrine that one should offer worship to one's own body wherein all gods reside, says that in the three worlds there is none higher than the ācārya. In the Nityotsava of Umānanda-nātha, pupil of Bhāsurānanda-nātha (i. e. Bhāskararāya as he was called before he took dīkṣā) the guru Bhāskararāya is praised in the following hyperbolical terms[1731] 'to whom no part of the earth was unseen (owing to his yogic sight), there was no king who was not his slave, to whom no śāstra was unknown; why use more words, whose form was the highest Śakti herself.' But the Jñāna-siddhi and Kulārṇava (XIII. 128) warn against gurus who falsely pretend to know the truth and give instruction in dharma from greed for money. The Kulārṇava (*ullāsas* XII and XIII) are devoted to the qualifications and greatness of guru. The Śāradātilaka also sets out the qualifications of the tāntrika guru (II. 142–144) and of the disciple (III. 145–152).[1732] The guru among other matters 'must know the essence of all Āgamas and the principles and meaning of all śāstras, he must be one whose words come out true, who has a quiet mind, who has profoundly studied the Veda and its meaning, who follows the path of Yoga and whose bearing is as beneficent as that of a deity.' Among the many requirements about a disciple,[1733] one is that he must keep secret the mantra and pūjā imparted by his guru. The disciple places the guru's feet on his head and surrenders his body, wealth and even life to

---

1730. आचार्यात्परतरं नास्ति त्रैलोक्ये सचराचरे। यस्य प्रसादात्प्राप्यन्ते सिद्धयोऽनेकधा बुधैः। Intro. to साधनमाला vol. II. p. LXIV–LXV.

1731. यस्यादृष्टो नैव भूमण्डलांशो यस्याज्ञातो विद्यते न क्षितीशः। यस्याज्ञातं नैव शास्त्रं किमन्यैः यस्याकारः सा परा शक्तिरेव ॥ Introductory verse 4 of the नित्योत्सव. Dr. B. Bhattacharya in his Intro. to the गुह्यसमाज° p. XIII has completely misunderstood this verse when he translates it as 'the Parā Sakti is she to whom no part of the wide universe remains unseen &c.'.

1732. सर्वागमानां सारज्ञः सर्वशास्त्रार्थतत्त्ववित्।...अमोघवचनः शान्तो वेदवेदार्थपारगः। योगमार्गानुसन्धायी देवताहृदयङ्गमः। शारदा° II. 142–144.

1733. मन्त्रपूजारहस्यानि यो गोपयति सर्वदा। शारदा° II. 151.

the guru. The necessity of a guru for the acquisition of esoteric philosophy is stressed by the Upaniṣads also. For, example the Kaṭhopaniṣad[1734] says 'this knowledge cannot be obtained by ratiocination, it can be understood well only when expounded by another'; the Chāndogya (IV. 9. 3) says 'Sir, I have heard from men like you that only knowledge that is learnt from a teacher leads to real good'. The Liṅgapurāṇa[1735] and others say that guru is identical with Śiva and the rewards of devotion to Śiva and to the guru are the same. The Kulārṇava (XI. 46) emphasizes that the order of the succession of gurus, the Āgamas, Āmnāya, mantra and practices—all these when learnt from the lips of a guru become fruitful and not otherwise. The Prapañcasāra provides 'the disciple should consider in his mind that guru, *devatā* and mantra are one and should repeat a hundred times the mantra that he received by the favour of the guru.'

The Vedānta system requires for its understanding high intellectual and moral attainments and could be followed by only a few gifted souls. It is claimed that Tantras provide a method which assists men of ordinary intellect and which utilizes visual and physical processes for the attainment of spiritual experience, for the development of psychic forces and for the quick attainment of liberation by such practices as the repetition of mantras, mudrās, nyāsa, maṇḍalas, cakras and yantras. The respect for the guru sometimes reached amongst Tāntrik writers to extreme and disgusting lengths as the note below will indicate.[1736]

1734. नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ठ। कठ II. 9.

1735. यो गुरुः स शिवः प्रोक्तो यः शिवः स गुरुः स्मृतः। यथा शिवस्तथा विद्या यथा विद्या तथा गुरुः॥ शिव-विद्यागुरोस्तस्माद् भक्त्या च सदृशं फलम्। सर्वदेवमयो देवि सर्वशक्तिमयो हि सः॥ लिङ्गपुराण I. 85. 164–165; गुरुर्ब्रह्मा गुरुर्विष्णुर्गुरुर्देवो महेश्वरः। गुरुरेव परं ब्रह्म तस्मै श्रीगुरवे नमः॥ देवीभागवत XI. 1. 49; in the ललितोपाख्यान in the ब्रह्माण्डपु. it is said 'मनुष्यचर्मणा बद्धः साक्षात्परशिवः स्वयम्। सच्छिष्यानुग्रहार्थाय गूढं पर्यटति क्षितौ॥ अत्रिनेत्रः शिवः साक्षादचतुर्बाहुरच्युतः। अचतुर्वदनो ब्रह्मा श्रीगुरुः कथितः प्रिये॥' 43. 68–70. These verses from ललितोपाख्यान are the same as कुलार्णव XIII. 54 and 57 and several verses are common to both. The question as to who is the borrower is very difficult to decide. The शारदातिलक (V. 113–114) has 'गुरुविद्यादेवतानामैक्यं सम्भावयन् धिया। प्रणमेद् दण्डवद्भूमौ गुरुं तं देवतात्मकम्॥ तस्य पादाम्बुजद्वन्द्वं निजे मूर्धनि योजयेत्। शरीरमर्थं प्राणं च सर्वं तस्मै निवेदयेत्॥'; गुरुणा समनुगृहीतं मन्त्रं सद्यो जपेच्छताावृत्त्या। गुरुदेवतामनूनामैक्यं सम्भावयन् धिया शिष्यः॥ प्रपञ्चसार VI. 122.

1736. भगिनीं वा सुतां भार्यां यो दद्यात्कुलयोगिने। मधुमत्ताय देवेशि तस्य पुण्यं न गण्यते॥ q. by ताराभक्तिसुधार्णव IV. p. 116.

The teaching of Tāntrika texts about the five *makāras* must have created a very unhealthy and debased state among all classes, particularly the lower orders of Society. The centuries from the 7th to the 12th A. D. were the peak period of Tāntrik works and cults, both Hindu and Buddhist. In a certain cult of the Vajrayāna the gurus wore a blue vesture. A story is narrated of a guru (a monk) of the *sammitiya* sect who went dressed in a blue dress to a courtezan. He did not return to the monastery at night. When asked in the morning by his disciples why he put on a blue dress, he explained the great spiritual merit of the blue-coloured dress. Since then his followers began to wear blue dress and in their book called 'Nīlapaṭadarśana' it is written 'the god Kāmadeva (Eros) is a jewel, a courtezan is a jewel, wine is a jewel; I bow to these three jewels; other so-called jewels are three glass beads'. It should be remembered that for devout Buddhists, Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha are three Ratnas (jewels). The followers of the Nīlapaṭadarśana deemed these last three to be as worthless as glass beads. Vide Bhikṣu Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana's paper 'On Vajrayāna or Mantrayāna' in J. A. vol. 225 (1934) p. 216 where this is narrated. False gurus must have gone about deluding people with rosy prospects of bliss and liberation by the easy method of drinking wine, eating flesh and free association with all sorts of women. The Indian literature of those centuries is full of condemnation and caricatures of the methods of Tāntrik worship by means of wine, flesh and sexual laxity. A few instances may be cited here. In the *prākrit* play called Karpūramañjarī of Rājaśekhara (about 900 A. D.), a character called Bhairavānanda [1737] who was

---

1737. The original verses I. 22–24 are in Prākrit. Their Sanskrit equivalents are set out here. मन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां न किमपि जाने ध्यानं च नो किमपि गुरुप्रसादात्। मद्यं पिबामो महिलां रमामो मोक्षं च यामो कुलमार्गलग्नाः॥ रण्डा चण्डा दीक्षिता धर्मदारा मद्यं मांसं पीयते खाद्यते च। भिक्षा भोज्यं चर्मखण्डं च शय्या कौलो धर्मः कस्य नाभाति रम्यः॥ मुक्तिं भणन्ति हरिब्रह्ममुखा अपि देवा ध्यानेन वेदपठनेन क्रतुक्रियाभिः। एकेन केवलमुमादयितेन दृष्टो मोक्षः समं सुरतकेलिसुरारसैः॥. It is quite possible that the name भैरवानन्द is doubly suggestive. The परानन्दसूत्र mentions several Tāntrik teachers whose names end in आनन्द such as अमृतानन्द (pp. 54, 73), उन्मादानन्द (pp. 54, 72, 76), ज्ञानानन्द (pp. 54, 73, 91), देवानन्द (p. 44), परानन्द (pp. 72, 91 the author of परानन्दसूत्र), सुखानन्द (p. 54), सुरानन्द (pp. 54, 70, 72). Besides, several teachers have the word भैरव as part of their names and are profusely quoted in the परानन्दसूत्र, viz. आकाशभैरव (9 times), उन्मत्तभैरव (17 times), कालभैरव (11 times); भैरव as an author is mentioned once on p. 66. राजशेखर probably meant a hit at one or more of these

(*Continued on next page*)

supposed to possess wonderful powers is introduced and he says (while representing that he was somewhat tipsy) 'owing to the favour of our guru we know nothing about mantras or tantras or meditation. We drink wine, dally with women and yet, being devoted to the Kula path, we reach *mokṣa*. A fierce strumpet is given dīkṣā and made a lawful wife, wine is drunk and flesh is consumed, our food is got by begging for alms, our bed is a piece of hide. To whom would the Kauladharma not appear attractive? Even gods headed by Viṣṇu and Brahmā declare that liberation is attained by meditation, Veda study and performance of Vedic sacrifices; only one God, the husband of Umā, perceived that mokṣa (can be attained) by dalliance with women and by wine'. The Yaśastilaka-campū (composed in 959 A. D.) after referring to the Dakṣiṇa and Vāma paths of Śaivāgama quotes a verse of the great poet [1738] Bhāsa "a person should drink wine, look at the face of the woman dear to him, wear a dress naturally charming and free from being odd; may the adorable Śiva be long-lived, who (first) discovered such a path to mokṣa!" The Daśāvatāra-carita of Kṣemendra (3rd quarter of 11th century A. D.) states in one verse what the Tāntrik gurus and their followers did "Gurus declare that liberation follows by the drinking of wine from the same goblet by various craftsmen such as washermen, weavers, workers in hides, *kāpālikas*, in the procedure of cakrapūjā, and by dalliance with women without the least scruple and by always leading a life of festivities." [1739] The Rāja-taraṅgiṇī (middle of 12th

---

(Continued from last page)

tāntrik authors who favoured the makāras. Acc. to Intro. (p. XII) to पारानन्दसूत्र, the work was composed probably between 900 to 1200 A. D. The परशुराम-कल्पसूत्र (I. 40) provides that after दीक्षा the guru is to give a name to the disciple ending in आनन्दनाथ. The महानिर्वाण (X. 182) also says the same thing.

1738. इममेव च मार्गमाश्रित्याभाषि भासेन महाकविना। पेया सुरा प्रियतमामुखमीक्षणीयं ग्राह्यः स्वभावललितोऽविकृतश्च वेषः। येनेदमीदृशमदृश्यत मोक्षवर्त्म दीर्घायुरस्तु भगवान् स पिनाकपाणिः॥ यशस्तिलकचम्पू p. 251. This is verse 7 in the मत्तविलास-प्रहसन of पल्लव king महेन्द्रविक्रमवर्मन् put in the mouth of a कपालि. This creates a puzzle. Either the Yaśastilaka committed a mistake in naming the author or the verse is one from Bhāsa's genuine dramas not yet found and bodily taken by the author of the मत्तविलास which, being a parody, was after all not a serious matter. I incline to the latter view.

1739. चक्रस्थितौ रजक-वायक-चर्मकार-कापालिकप्रमुखशिल्पिभिरेकपात्रे। पानेन मुक्तिमविकल्परतोत्सवेन वृत्तेन चोत्सवता गुरवो वदन्ति॥ p. 162 of दशावतारचरित. चक्रपूजा will be referred to a little later.

century A. D.) has several references to the Tāntrikas and their doings. In V. 66 Kalhaṇa says that during[1740] the reign of Avantivarman of Kashmir, *siddhas* (persons possessed of miraculous powers like *aṇimā*) such as Bhaṭṭa Kallaṭa were born for the benefit of the world. In describing the effects of the rule of a good king Yaśaskara (939–948 A. D.), Kalhaṇa [1741] remarks that during his reign were not seen housewives figuring as divinities at the rite of gurudīkṣā and shaking their heads for detracting from the eminent character (attributed to) of their husbands.' King Kalaśa of Kashmir (1063–1089 A. D.) became a pupil of Pramadakaṇṭha, son of Amarakaṇṭha who was a good brāhmaṇa, but Kalaśa, who by nature was evil-minded, was instructed in evil practices by his guru Pramadakaṇṭha and the latter made the former ignore the distinction between women who are approachable and who are not. In this connection, Kalhaṇa bitterly [1742] bewails "what other unscrupulousness of this guru (of Kalaśa) should be described by me, when, leaving aside all scruples, he committed incestuous intercourse with his own daughter." This establishes that in the 11th century A. D.

1740. अनुग्रहाय लोकानां भट्टश्रीकल्लटादयः। अवन्तिवर्मणः काले सिद्धा भुवमवातरन्॥ राजत. V. 66. अवन्तिवर्मन् reigned from 855 A. D. to 883 A. D. Kallata's is a great name in Kashmir Śaivism. It may be noted that the Vajrayāna cult of Buddhism speaks of 84 सिद्धपुरुषs that flourished from the 7th to the 9th century A. D. Vide Intro. to E. B. p. 34 and Bhikṣu Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana's paper on 'the origin of Vajrayāna and the 84 siddhas' in J. A. vol. 225 (1934) pp 209–230 in which at pp. 220–225 there is a detailed list of the 84 *siddhas* from Lūipā to Bhalipā with their castes and status, place of origin and names of the contemporaries of some of them from the 8th century A. D. onwards. मत्स्येन्द्रनाथ is said to be the same as Lūipā; vide I. H. Q. vol. XXXI pp. 362–375 for Dr. Karambelkar's paper on 'Matsyendranātha and his Yoginī cult.'

1741. नादृश्यन्त च गेहिन्यो गुरुदीक्षोत्थदेवताः। कुर्वाणा भर्तृशीलश्रीनिषेधं मूर्धधूननैः॥ राजत. VI. 12. This shows that, there being equality of sexes among Tāntrikas, women used to be made gurus in Tāntrik rites. Vide प्राणतोषिणी p. 179 for qualifications of a woman *guru* and p. 540 for worship of the wife of a guru and of a woman as a guru in her own right. The guru and his predecessors are to be worshipped by disciples as sacrificers. When the latter praised the husbands of the women that had become gurus, they shook their heads in disagreement and thereby impliedly criticized the character of their husbands. Kalhaṇa says that this did not happen in the reign of Yaśaskara, who must have frowned upon the practices of tāntricism and hence occasions for women being gurus did not arise.

1742. गुरोर्गतविकल्पत्वं तस्यान्यत्किमिवोच्यताम्। त्यक्तशङ्कः भजते स्वसुतासुरतेपि यः॥ राजत. VII. 278.

in Kashmir there were Tāntrik gurus that literally carried out what the Guhyasamājatantra quoted in note 1724 apparently recommended to Buddhist Yogis. In the drama called Mohaparājaya by Yaśaḥpāla under king Ajayadeva, successor of Kumārapāla, among the *dramatis personae* is a *kaula* who declares his doctrine to be eating flesh every day, drinking wine without any qualms and allowing the mind free scope.[1743] Aparārka quotes a verse which shows that, in the midst of numerous cults, it was difficult to be consistent: "A person may be at heart a Kaula (follower of the Kula doctrine), in outward appearance he may look a Śaiva, and he may follow Vaidika rites in his usual practices. One should live grasping what is essential like the cocoanut [1744] fruit". It appears that great scholars and poets had a sneaking admiration for Tāntrika worship. The great writer Vidyāpati of Mithilā appears to be a Vaiṣṇava from his devotional songs, but wrote the Śaivasarvasvasāra (so he may be called a Śaiva), and wrote also Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī (and thus appears to have been a Śākta) and composed also a Tāntrik [1745] work. The very first verse of Vidyāpati's 'Puruṣaparīkṣā' contains an invocation of Ādi-Śakti.' Bengal and Assam were the strongholds of Śākta doctrines and even now Kālī worship is still in vogue there, but it was the great Bengal

1743. In मोहराजपराजय (G. O. S.) p. 100 the कौल says 'खाद्यते मांसमनुदिनं पीयते मद्यं च सुकसङ्कल्पम्। अनिवारितमनःप्रसर एष धर्मो मया दिष्टः॥ (Sanskrit rendering of a Prākrit verse). The drama was written between 1172-1175 A. D.

1744. अन्तःकौलं बहिःशैवं लोकाचारे तु वैदिकम्। सारमादाय तिष्ठेत्तु नारिकेलफलं यथा॥ अपरार्क p. 10. I prefer the reading of one the mss. noted in the foot notes. The printed text reads अन्तःशैवं बहिःकौलं लोकाचारे etc. The cocoanut fruit presents three aspects, first there is the hard outside shell, then there is the soft and tasty kernel inside the hard shell and thirdly there is water in addition to the soft kernel. The कुलार्णवतन्त्र has 'अन्तःकौलो बहिःशैवो जनमध्ये तु वैष्णवः। कौलं सुगोपयेद्देवि नारिकेलफलाम्बुवत्॥ XI. 83. One ms. reads अन्तःकौला बहिःशैवाः सभायां वैष्णवा मताः and this last is often quoted. The कौलावलीनिर्णय (X. 84-95) reads अन्तःशाक्ता बहिःशैवाः...मताः। नानावेशधराः कौला विचरन्ति महीतले॥. The sect mark of both Śaivas and Śāktas is *tripuṇḍra* (three parallel lines of holy ashes on the forehead from one eye to the other, drawn with three fingers other than the thumb and small finger). Vide बृहज्जाबालोपनिषद् IV. 10-11, देवीभागवत XI. 15. 17-23.

1745. Vide a paper of D. C. Bhattacharya in J. G. J. R. I. vol. VI pp. 241-247 on Vidyāpati's work on Tantra. The first verse of पुरुषपरीक्षा (Darbhanga ed. of 1888) is 'ब्रह्मापि यां नौति स्तुतः सपर्णां (सुराणां ?) यामर्चितोऽप्यर्चयन्तीन्दुमौलिः। यां ध्यायति ध्यानगतोऽपि विष्णुस्तामादिशक्तिं शिरसा प्रपद्ये॥'

king Ballālasena who discarded Devīpurāṇa as an authority in his encyclopaedic work on gifts called Dānasāgara.[1746]

It is possible that the founders of the Tāntrik or Śākta cult of the five *makāras* threw defiance at the terrible aspect of God or the Highest Spirit, that rules the destinies of men and things and that made men sometimes suffer terribly even if they led lives of virtue, to do the worst for their disregard of conventional morality and social practices and hoped by their Yoga exercises to attain to high psychical powers and bliss.[1747] There is another possible motive also. Masses of common people were being drawn towards Buddhism. The founders of Hindu Tāntrik cults wanted to retain them within the Hindu fold. As common people drank wine and ate meat, they were told that they would attain higher spiritual levels even while indulging in meat and drink provided they followed Tāntrik gurus and practices. The idea was that Śakti was all and was for all; *bhoga* (enjoyment) need not be given up, as man is part of Devī or Śiva. Bhoga should be sublimated, that is all that is required in Kaulaśāstra. The Tāntrikas [1748] substitute a yoga of enjoyment (bhoga) for the yoga of abstinence and asceticism. When indulging in the left-hand path practices the sādhaka is supposed or held to be destroying the egoistic elements of the soul.

The Mahānirvāṇatantra and a few others endeavour to stem the tide of sexual immorality and promiscuity. For example, Rāmeśvara, the commentator of Paraśurāmakalpasūtra, says that one that has not conquered his senses has no *adhikāra* for Kaulamārga (p. 153). This is in direct conflict with what even the Mahānirvāṇatantra says that all men from brāhmaṇas to the untouchables have adhikāra for Kula practices. Modern apologists for Tāntrism emphasize that the instructions embodied in the Guhyasamāja, the directions for the mode of life to be led by followers of Vajrayāna, apply only to the Yogis who have attained some degree of yogic perfection. But the obvious

---

1746. नानावेशधराः कौलाः कुलाचारेषु निश्चलाः। सेवन्ते त्वां कुलाचारैर्नहि तान् बाधते कलिः ॥ महानिर्वाणतन्त्र IV. 63.

1747. Vide Dr. B. Bhattacharya's Intro. to Guhyasamāja p. XXII for the above sentiments.

1748. यत्रास्ति भोगो न च तत्र मोक्षो यत्रास्ति मोक्षो न च तत्र भोगः। श्रीसुन्दरीसेवनतत्पराणां भोगश्च मोक्षश्च करस्थ एव॥ quoted in हंसविलास (from कौलरहस्य) p. 104; विप्राद्यन्त्यजपर्यन्ता द्विपदा येऽत्र भूतले। ते सर्वेऽस्मिन्कुलाचारे भवेयुरधिकारिणः॥ महानिर्वाण 14. 184.

reply is 'who is to decide that a particular person had attained the minimum spiritual level except the man himself and, supposing that all the directions were meant for Yogis, why was it necessary to say in a blatant manner and language that a Yogi practising Vajrayāna may engage in what common and less sophisticated people deem to be incest? This is not the place to reply to all apologists for ancient and medieval Tāntrik works. But a few must be dealt with because they are liable to create misunderstandings, if allowed to go uncriticized. In his Preface to 'Principles of Tantra' Part 2, Sir John Woodroffe states (p. IX.) that the use of flesh, fish and wine was common in the Vedic age and that the Mahābhārata and some Purāṇas like the Kālikā, Mārkaṇḍeya and Kūrma refer to consumption of wine, meat and fish. This looks like special pleading and is misleading. The question is: was *surā* offered to the gods in every day or periodic sacrifices as an offering in the Ṛgveda or any other Veda. In the Vedic age wine may have been known and even drunk, but what is material to recognize is that there is a difference made between Soma and *surā*. Vide Śat.[1749] Br. "Soma is truth, prosperity, light and surā is untruth, misery and darkness" (V. 1. 5. 28). While Soma is mentioned hundreds of times in the Ṛgveda, has the 9th maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda specially reserved for its praises and was offered to gods, the word *surā* occurs only six times in the Ṛgveda and it is nowhere expressly stated that it was offered to any god as a religious offering; on the contrary, in a hymn to Varuṇa, surā is put forward as leading to the commission of sin just as anger and gambling do (Ṛg. VII. 86. 6 'na sa svo. dakṣo Varuṇa dhrutiḥ sā surā manyur-vibhīdako acittiḥ). In his zeal for the vindication of Tāntrism Arthur Avalon is injudicious enough to misinterpret simple words. In the Intro. to 'Principles of Tantra' p. VII he quotes Ṛg. I. 166. 7 "arcantyarkam madirasya pītaye" and translates "worshipping the Sun before drinking madirā (wine)." The word here is *madira* (and not 'madirā'), it is an adjective and means "exhilarating". The word "Madirā" never occurs in the Ṛg. while "madira" as an adjective, occurs at least sixteen times and qualifies Soma, Indu, Aṁśu, Rasa or Madhu, generally expressed (and rarely implied). There is no word for "before." That quarter means 'they (the worshippers or Maruts) worship (Indra) who is worthy of praise (and a friend of the Maruts) in order that he may come for

---

1749. सत्यं वै श्रीर्ज्योतिः सोमोऽनृतं पाप्मा तमः सुरा। शतपथ V. 1. 5. 28.

drinking the exhilarating (Soma).' The word madirā (for wine) hardly ever occurs in any genuine work of Vedic times. Its earliest occurrence is probably in the Mahābhārata. Reference is also made by modern apologists to the offering of surā in the Sautrāmaṇī *iṣṭi* in honour of Indra. But the circumstances are peculiar. Sautrāmaṇī is only one out of numerous sacrifices and the occasions for performing it were rare i. e. it was performed at the end of Rājasūya and also at the end of *Agnicayana* and when a priest who had drunk too much of soma vomited. The most important fact, however, is that the remnants of surā offered in Sautrāmaṇī were not drunk by the priests engaged in it but a brāhmaṇa had to be hired for drinking the remnants and if no brāhmaṇa could be secured then the remnants were to be poured over an ant-hill (vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1226 for details). The Kāṭhakasaṁhitā [1750] contains an interesting passage "Therefore an elderly person and a youngster, the daughter-in-law and the father-in-law, drink liquor and remain babbling together; thoughtlessness is sin; therefore a brāhmaṇa does not drink surā with the thought that 'otherwise (if I drink it) I may be tainted by sin'; therefore this is for kṣatriya; one should say to a brāhmaṇa that surā, if drunk by a kṣatriya, does not harm the latter." These passages show that not only the priests did not drink surā even in Sautrāmaṇī but that it had become difficult to hire a brāhmaṇa for drinking it by the time of the Kāṭhaka-saṁhitā. The passage of the Vājasaneya Saṁhitā 19. 5 relied on at p. VII (of Intro. to 'Principles of Tantra' part II) also refers to Sautrāmaṇī and to no other sacrifice. The mantra is "Brahma kṣatram pavate teja indriyam surayā somaḥ suta āsuto madāya" and means that "Soma when mixed with surā becomes a strong drink and leads to intoxication." The Chāndogya V. 10. 9 (q. above p. 1578 n. 943) counts the drinker of surā among the five grave sinners. Therefore, there is hardly any analogy between the offering of wine in Sautrāmaṇī and the teaching about offering wine to Devī as provided in the Tantras. Similarly, the reference to the Atharvaveda as containing magical rites does not help at all. Society had advanced far beyond that stage and Manu XI. 63 looked upon abhicāra (i. e. performance of a magic rite like Śyenayāga for killing a person) and mūlakarma (i. e. bringing

---

1750. तस्माज्ज्यायांश्च कनीयांश्च स्नुषा श्वशुरश्च सुरां पीत्वा सह लालपत आसते। पाप्मा वै माल्व्यं तस्माद् ब्राह्मणः सुरां न पिबति पाप्मना नेत्संसृज्या इति तदेतद् क्षत्रियाय ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयान्नैनं सुरा पीता हिनस्ति। काठकसंहिता XII. 12.

under one's control a person or a woman by herbs and mantras) as a sin, though a lesser one (an upapātaka). The reference to the Mahābhārata (Udyogaparva, 59.5 ff) is again misleading. Wine was drunk by people in the Mahābhārata times, but not as part of a religious ritual as in the Tantras. Vide pp. 964–966 of H. of Dh. vol. III for a note on 'intoxicating drinks.' The reference to Mārkaṇḍeya and other purāṇas is of no avail as evidence, since at least the present author holds that those parts of the Purāṇas were written and interpolated after Tāntrik rites had taken a firm hold on some sections of the Hindu society. The reference to sexual intercourse in the Mahāvrata [1751] is most misleading. In the Tantras like the Kulārṇava and the Guhyasamāja it is the sādhaka himself who is to practise *maithuna* as one of the ways of securing marvellous powers and higher spiritual attainments. But in the Mahāvrata the sexual intercourse is by strangers to the sacrifice (and not by the *yajamāna* nor by any of the priests), is a purely symbolical act and bears no analogy to a sādhaka himself engaging in maithuna as a religious rite to placate the Devī. Even a late reformist work like the Mahānirvāṇa (VIII. 174–175) expressly says that those of the five tattvas which a sādhaka can secure, such as flesh and others, should have recited over them the mantra 'āṃ, hrīṃ, kroṃ, svāhā' a hundred times, that he should reflect that everything is a product of *brahma*, should close his eyes, should offer those to Kālī and should himself drink and eat them. As the Tāntrik prescriptions of the *makāras* for attainment of miraculous powers and of liberation had shocked people and had brought the tantras into great disrepute, later Hindu Tāntrik works like the Śaktisaṅgamatantra (between 1555–1607 A. D.) began to offer symbolic interpretations. They [1752] say that the

---

1751. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II pp 1243–1245 for the Mahāvrata, which is the last day but one in a *sattra*.

1752. गुडार्द्रकरसो देवि मुद्रा तु प्रथमा मता। पिण्याकं लवणं देवि द्वितीया परिकीर्तिता। लशुनं तिन्तिडी चैव तृतीया परिकीर्तिता। गोधूममाषसम्भूता सुन्दरी च चतुर्थिका। शक्त्यालापः पञ्चमी स्यात्पञ्च मुद्राः प्रकीर्तिताः॥ शक्तिसङ्गम, तारारवण्ड, 32, 13–15; vide महानिर्वाणतन्त्र VI. 9–10 where products of grains of rice, barely or wheat with ghee or fried grain are called मुद्रा. न मद्यं माधवीमद्यं मद्यं शक्तिरसोद्भवम्। सुषुम्ना शङ्खिनी मुद्रा उन्मन्यद्युत्तमं रसः॥ सामरस्यामृतोल्लासं मैथुनं च सदाशिवम्। महाकुण्डलिनी शक्तिस्तद्योगार्थं महेश्वरि।...संयोगामृतयोगेन कुण्डल्युत्थानकारणात्। शक्तिसङ्गम॰, तारारवण्ड 32, 25–27, 32. Vide 'Śakti and Śākta' pp. 339–340 where madya, māṃsa, matsya and maithuna are interpreted esoterically for a 'divyabhāva' following Yoginītantra (chap. VI) and from Āgamasāra. One verse from the former may be quoted

(*Continued on next page*)

words 'madya, mudrā, maithuna' &c. are not used in the ordinary popular sense but in a special esoteric sense. For example, mudrā has several senses, viz. a mixture of jaggery and ginger, or of salt and oil-cake or garlic and tamarind fruit, or wheat and māṣa beans, that madya (wine) is not what is prepared from mādhavī (spring flower) but it springs from the joyful experience (or *rasa*) of Śakti, when effort is made to awaken the Kuṇḍalinī. It may be admitted that some Tāntrik works and writers divide men into three classes, paśu (the bestial ones), vīra (those that have made great progress on the path of spiritual discipline) and daiva (those who are godlike). As regards these three, the five makāras are assigned by some apologistic writers different meanings. D. N. Bose in his work 'Tantras, their philosophy and occult secrets' boldly asserts (p. 110) that the real significance of the five makāras has been deliberately perverted by vicious people and explains (p. 111) that *madya* is the nectarine stream issuing from the cavity of the brain where the soul resides, matsya means suppression of vital airs, māṁsa means 'vow of silence,' 'maithuna' means 'meditation on the acts of creation and destruction.'

The Tāntrikas clothe their practices in bombastic and high-sounding words. The five makāras are called pañca-tattvas, kuladravyas or kulatattvas. Maithuna is generally referred to as pañcamatattva, the woman with whom sexual intercourse is to be had or who was at least to be associated with a male in Tantra worship is called Śakti (vide Kulārṇava VII 39–43 and Mahānirvāṇa VI. 18–20) or *prakṛti* or *latā* and this special ritual is called 'Latāsādhana' (Mahānirvāṇa I. 52). Wine is called tīrthavāri (holy water) or kāraṇa (VIII. 168 and VI. 17). The Mahānirvāṇa-tantra, though a reformist work and in certain cases asking the king to punish drunkards (XI. 113–121),

---

(*Continued from last page*)

'सहस्रारोपरि बिन्दौ कुण्डल्या मेलनं शिवे। मैथुनं परमं द्रव्यं यतीनां परिकीर्तितम्॥'. Substitutional तत्त्वs are also variously mentioned for पशु, who is the lowest kind of the worshippers of Śakti. The कौलावलीनिर्णय V. 113–123 suggests various substitutes viz. a ब्राह्मण may employ honey in a copper vessel or cow's milk or the water of cocoanut fruit in a bell-metal vessel, that, in the absence of flesh, garlic and ginger may be used for flesh, milk of buffalo or sheep for fish, roasted fruits and roots for *maithuna*. It will be, however, noticed in the above and also later on that the explanations do not all completely agree and therefore raise doubts about their veracity.

waxes eloquent over wine and praises it as Tārā in the form [1753] of a fluid substance, as the saviour of individual souls, as the mother (or producer) of bhoga (enjoyment) and mokṣa (liberation) and as the remover of misfortunes and diseases and after some further praise of wine winds up by saying that those men who drink wine according to the rules and with a well-controlled mind are gods on earth (XI. 108). For the worship of Śakti the five tattvas are absolutely necessary (Mahānirvāṇa-tantra V. 21–24 quoted in note 1695 above and [1754] Kulārṇava V. 69 and 76). Some tantras say that the meaning of tattva differs according as the person concerned is Tāmasika (a *paśu* kind of worshipper), Rājasika (a vīra as he is called), sāttvika (a divya, a person who is godlike). Madya means according to various Tāntrik Texts real wine as well as a substitute like cocoanut water or any other liquid; it also means that intoxicating knowledge that comes of Yoga practices, whereby the worshipper becomes senseless as regards the external world. *Māṁsa* is the act whereby the sādhaka surrenders himself and his action to Lord Śiva. *Matsya* (fish, of which the first part 'mat' means 'mine') is that psychical state by which the worshipper sympathizes with the pleasure and pain of all beings. *Maithuna* is the union of the Śakti Kuṇḍalinī (the woman inside a man's body) in the Mūlādhāra-cakra with the supreme Śiva in the Sahasrāracakra in the highest centre of the brain and is the stream of the sweet juice that drops from the Sahasrāra. Preparation of hemp (called *vijayā* or '*bhāng*') is madya for some. The Mahānirvāṇa says (VIII. 170 and 173) that 'madhura-traya' may be substituted for wine and for 'Maithuna' meditation on the feet of the (image of) Devī and *japa* of the desired mantra may be substituted. The Kaulāvalīnirṇaya (III. 111) boldly states that if a man, after partaking of vijayā (*bhāng*) engages in meditation, he sees directly before him the form of the goddess as described in the Dhyānamantra. Some Tantras like the

---

1753. सुरा द्रवमयी तारा जीवनिस्तारकारिणी। जननी भोगमोक्षाणां नाशिनी विपदां रुजाम्॥ महानिर्वाण० XI. 105.

1754. कुलद्रव्यैर्विना कुर्याज्जपयज्ञतपोव्रतम्। निष्फलं तद्भवेद् देवि भस्मनीव यथा हुतम्॥; मन्त्रपूतं कुलद्रव्यं गुरुदेवार्पितं प्रिये। ये पिबन्ति जनास्तेषां स्तन्यपानं न विद्यते॥ कुलार्णव V. 69 and 76. The words स्तन्य ... विद्यते mean that he is not born again. The कुलार्णव (V. 79–80) ordains 'सुरा शक्तिः शिवो मांसं तद्भोक्ता भैरवः स्वयम्। तयोरैक्यसमुत्पन्न आनन्दो मोक्ष उच्यते॥ आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो रूपं तच्च देहे व्यवस्थितम्। तस्याभिव्यञ्जकं मद्यं योगिभिस्तेन पीयते॥'.

Kaulajñānanirṇaya and Bhāskararāya[1755] in his commentary on Lalitāsahasranāma say that when Kuṇḍalinī is roused by a yogin and it reaches the thousand-petalled cakra (Sahasrāra) from which (that has on its pericarp the moon) drops nectar which is figuratively spoken of as *madya* (vide notes 1716, 1752). The Kulārṇava at first asserts (I. 105-107) 'Mukti does not result from the study of the Veda nor by the study of śāstras, it results from (correct) knowledge alone, that the āśramas are not a means of mokṣa nor are the darśanas the means, nor all the śāstras, that it is knowledge alone that is the cause, that it is the knowledge imparted by the teaching of the guru that confers *mukti*, all (other) vidyās are mockery.' Then in the Vedāntic strain it affirms (I. 111-112) "two words (respectively) lead to bondage or liberation viz. (this is) '*mine*' or 'nothing is *mine*'. A person falls in bondage by the thought 'this is mine' and becomes liberated by realising 'nothing is mine' and that that is proper action that does not lead to bondage and that is real lore that leads to liberation." After these high thoughts the same Tantra (II. 22-23 and 29) proceeds to Kaula doctrine. 'If a man is a yogin he does not (ordinarily) enjoy life, while one who enjoys life does not know yoga; but the Kaula doctrine combines both *yoga* and *bhoga* and is superior to all (other doctrines); in the Kaula doctrine bhoga turns into yoga directly, what is sin (acc. to ordinary people) becomes meritorious, *saṁsāra* turns into mokṣa. Kaula knowledge enlightens him whose mind is purified by the mantras of Śaiva worship, Durgā worship &c."

The Kulārṇava appears to be in two minds to ordinary men like the present writer. While in one breath as shown in note 1718 it frankly recommends the drinking of wine and eating of flesh to the followers of Kaula doctrine, it also endeavours to give an esoteric meaning to the *makāras* as follows (V. 107-112): Frequently reaching the *brahmarandhra* from the mūlādhāra, there arises the bliss of the union of the Kuṇḍalinī-Śakti with the moon in the form of Intelligence (*cit*, Śiva); the person who is intent on tasting the nectar oozing from the lotus in the

---

1755. सा (कुण्डलिनी) हि मूलाधाराख्ये चक्रे सार्धत्रिवलयाकारेण सुप्ता सती योगिभिरुत्थाप्य षट्चक्राणि ब्रह्मविष्ण्वादिग्रन्थींश्च भेदयन्ती सहस्रारं नीता सती तत्कर्णिकारूपचन्द्रमण्डलादमृतं स्रावयति। p. 52 of भास्करराय's com. सौभाग्यभास्कर on ललितासहस्रनाम on verses 87-91 कुलामृतैकरसिका ... सहस्राराम्बुजारूढा सुधासाराभिवर्षिणी। ... महासक्तिः कुण्डलिनी बिसतन्तुतनीयसी॥ (Nir. ed. of 1935). Compare कौलज्ञाननिर्णय VI. 18-19 p. 16.

crown of the head is said to drink *sudhā* (nectar, wine); other people drink mere wine. When the adept[1756] in Yoga cutting the beast (ego) doing good or evil actions with the sword of knowledge (of reality) makes his mind merge in the Highest, he is said to be eater of pala (the Highest, flesh). The (Yogin) who restraining the several senses by his mind concentrates them on the Self, becomes 'matsyāśī',[1757] others are only killers of living beings. The Śakti (the woman associated with a sādhaka) of a beastly man is unenlightened but that of the Kaulika is enlightened; he who honours (or resorts to) such a Śakti is really a worshipper of Śakti. When a man is filled through and through with the bliss due to the union of the Highest Śakti with the Self (Śiva), that is called Maithuna (copulation); all other men are merely licentious persons.

The apologists for unpopular Tāntrik practices offer explanations of the five 'makāras' more or less on the lines of the Kulārṇava. For example, in his Introduction to the 'Principles of Tantra' (part II) Arthur Avalon (Sir John Woodroffe) gives (pp. CVII–CVIII) an esoteric explanation of the word 'drinking' used in such a verse as that in the Pārānandasūtra, 'Having drunk again and again, having fallen upon the earth, then having got up and again drunk (wine) there is no rebirth.'[1758]

1756. आमूलाधारमाब्रह्मरन्ध्रं गत्वा पुनः पुनः। चिच्चन्द्रकुण्डलीशक्तिसामरस्यसुखोदयः॥ व्योमपङ्कजनिस्यन्दसुधापानरतो नरः। सुधापानमिदं प्रोक्तमितरे मद्यपायिनः॥ पुण्यापुण्यपशुं हत्वा ज्ञानखड्गेन योगवित्। परे लयं नयेच्चित्तं पलाशी स निगद्यते॥ मनसा चेन्द्रियगणं संयम्यात्मनि योजयेत्। मत्स्याशी स भवेद्देवि शेषाः स्युः प्राणिहिंसकाः॥ अप्रबुद्धा पशोः शक्तिः प्रबुद्धा कौलिकस्य च। शक्तिं तां सेवयेद्यस्तु स भवेच्छक्तिसेवकः॥ पराशक्त्यात्ममिथुनसंयोगानन्दनिर्भरः। य आस्ते मैथुनं तत् स्यादपरे स्त्रीनिषेवकाः॥ कुलार्णव V. 107–112. The 4th *tattva* is *Mudrā*, but the latter word is often applied to the Śakti associated with a sādhaka.

1757. 'Palāśī' means 'eater or enjoyer of Pala.' Pala means 'flesh', and pala stands for Para (Highest) 'aś' r and l are often interchangeable in Sanskrit and the root 'aś' may mean 'to reach' as well as 'to eat. Matsyāśī literally means 'eater of fish,' but in the esoteric interpretation "matsya" stands for 'manas' (mind) plus 'sya' representing 'saṁyama' (restraint).

1758. जीवन्मुक्तः पिबेदेवमन्यथा पतितो भवेदिति। पुनः पीत्वा पुनः पीत्वा पतित्वा धरणीतले। उत्थाय च पुनः पीत्वा पुनर्जन्म न विद्यते॥ पारानन्दसूत्र p. 17 sūtras 81–82; the Intro. to 'Principles of Tantra' (part II) p. CVIII. It reads the first half of the verse as पीत्वा पीत्वा पुनः पीत्वा पीत्वा पतति भूतले. But there is hardly any difference in the literal meaning. Vide कुलार्णवतन्त्र VII. 100 which reads पीत्वा पीत्वा ... यावत्पतति भूतले.' रामेश्वर, commentator of परशुराम-कल्पसूत्र,

(*Continued on next page*)

He explains 'Being thus awakened Kuṇḍalinī enters the great road to liberation (mukti), that is, the Sushumnā nerve, and penetrating the centres one by one, ascends to the Sahasrāra and there coming in blissful communion with the Lord of Lords, again descends down through the same passage to the Mūlādhāra Chakra. Nectar is said to flow from such communion. The sādhaka drinks it and becomes supremely happy. This is the wine called Kulāmṛta, which a sādhaka of the spiritual plane drinks...... In reference to a sādhaka of the spiritual (ādhyātmika) class the Tantra says 'Pītvā pītvā...vidyate'. During the first stage of Ṣaṭ-cakra-sādhanā the sādhaka cannot suppress his breath for a sufficiently long time at a stretch to enable him to practise concentration and meditation in each centre of Power. He cannot therefore detain Kuṇḍalinī within the Sushumnā longer than his power of Kumbhaka permits. He must consequently come down upon the earth i. e. the Mūlādhāra, which is the centre of the element earth, after having drunk of the heavenly ambrosia. The sādhaka must practise this again and again and by constant practice, the cause of rebirth i. e. *vāsanā* (desire) is removed." This explanation sounds very profound and highly psychical, but it is not at all convincing. Similarly, the present author wonders how many writers on Tantras and how many Tāntrikas understood the theory of sublimation put forward in 'Tantras as a way of realization' (Cultural Heritage of India, Vol. IV. pp. 233–235) by way of explaining the insistence on five makāras. The first question is: why was it necessary to employ vulgar language to describe a state of profound bliss? Supposing the explanation of madya offered by Woodroffe is accepted, what is the explanation about offering flesh and fish? One cannot easily get out of 'matsyāśī' and 'māṁsāśī' the esoteric sense required by the apologists. The Kulārṇava, the Pārānanda-sūtra and several

---

(*Continued from last page*)

quotes पीत्वा ... पतति भूतले, and takes it in a literal sense by citing a passage आगलान्तं पिबेद् द्रव्यं (on V. 22 p. 213) from कुलार्णव VII. 99. कौलावलीतन्त्र (VIII. 164–165) has this verse but reads पतित्वा च महीतले. The next verse in this last work is: अलिमीनाङ्गनासङ्गे यत्सुखं जायते नृणाम्। तदेव मोक्षो विदुषामबुधानां च पातकम्। VIII.165–166. Verses 213–214 refer to the fifth makāra in *cakrapūjā* and verses 223–225 justify promiscuous intercourse in Śrīcakra and verse 226 says 'it is the sinful *vāsanā* that is reprehensible, but to the pure-hearted everything is pure (*omnia sancta sanctis*)'. The कालीविलासतन्त्र (ed. by A. Avalon, 1917 Tantrik Texts, vol. VI.) has the verse पीत्वा पीत्वा ... पुनः पीत्वा वचनं सत्यसंमतम्। (VI. 25).

other works almost always employ the words madya, māṁsa and fish in the ordinary sense. They rarely, if at all, drop the hint that words like matsya and māṁsa are being used in an esoteric sense and proceed to deal with realities of madya and flesh. The Kulārṇava quotes (II. 126) the verse of Manu IX, 93 (surā vai malam-annānām &c.), provides for the preparation of the three kinds of surā (V. 15–21), and says (V. 30) that surā is the 12th kind among intoxicants and that there are eleven other kinds of intoxicants made from jack-fruit, grapes, dates, sugar-cane &c. (V. 29). In XI. 22–35 the Kulārṇava dilates upon the etiquette to be observed in drinking wine as part of Kaula practice. It proceeds (V. 44) to divide flesh into three classes viz. of animals that fly in the sky (birds), of acquatic animals and of those that move on the earth. The [1759] Svacchandatantra (a work of great authority in Kashmir Śaivism) prescribes that various kinds of fish and meat and other food that can be licked and drunk should be poured in front of Śiva (image) and one should not stint for money. Quotations from Pārānanda-sūtra (notes 1698, 1703-4) make it perfectly clear that the words madya, māṁsa, and maithuna are employed therein in the ordinary sense. Pārānandasūtra (on pp. 80–81, paragraphs 69–70 and pp. 82–83 para. 76–80) describes such obscene details of the sādhaka's sexual intercourse that it is not possible to set them down here. The ordinary worship of Devī was elaborate enough, containing as it did 16 *upacāras* (vide p. 164 note 420 above). Where was the necessity of bringing in wine, meat and maithuna as an absolutely necessary part of the worship of Devī? The Kulārṇava and other tantras praise the Vedas, employ vedic mantras and quote[1760] Upaniṣad and Gītā passages. For example, Mahānirvāṇa V. 197 ff employs Vedic mantras (as noted on p. 1058) for sanctifying the five makāras, the three mantras 'Āpo hi ṣṭhā' Ṛg. X. 9. 1–3 in Nāmakaraṇa (*ibid.* IX. 150–152), 'Tac-cakṣur' Ṛg. VII. 66. 16 in Niṣkramaṇa (*ibid.* IX. 163), 'Viṣṇuryonim' Ṛg. X. 184. 1 in Garbhādhāna (*ibid.* IX. 96), 'Ayam te yonir' Ṛg. III. 29. 10 in the worship of Agni (*ibid.* IX. 21) and the verse 'Kālī Karālī' (Muṇḍakopaniṣad I. 2. 4)

1759. मत्स्यमांसान्यनेकानि लेह्यपेयानि यानि च। अग्रमापूरयेच्छम्भोर्वित्तशाठ्यविवर्जितः॥ स्वच्छन्दतन्त्र II. (पटल) 135 (Kashmir S. series with the com. उद्योत of क्षेमराज); मद्यं मांसं तथा मत्स्यानन्यानि च वरानने। साचारांश्च निराचारांल्लिङ्गिनो न जुगुप्सयेत्। *ibid* V. 48.

1760. कुलार्णव XII. 33 cites the verse यस्य देवे &c. (which is श्वेताश्वतरोप. VI. 23); vide महानिर्वाण II. 44–45 for adopting तै. उप. 'भीषास्माद्वातः पवते भीषोदेति सूर्यः। ... मृत्युर्धावति पञ्चमः।

in the worship of the seven tongues of Agni. The Mahānirvāṇa (VIII. 214-215) prescribes Gītā IV. 24 (brahmārpaṇam brahma havir) as the mantra to be recited by the leader of the Tattvacakra in offering the five *tattvas* and in sanctifying them. In spite of all this lip service to the Veda the tantras ignore the great moral dangers involved in their persistent teaching of five makāras and also pay no heed to the impressive advice of the Gītā (III. 21) that whatever a great or honoured man does or holds as authoritative is followed by all common people. There are several late medieval works about the Kaula cult that speak of drinking wine, eating flesh and *maithuna* in the vulgar sense as means of Devī worship and yet assert that by doing so *mukti* (liberation) would be secured. Two verses from a ms of a tāntrik work called Kaularahasya (containing one hundred verses) will bring home to the reader how common people understood the cult of the *makāras*.[1761]

Prof. Heinrich Zimmer in the 'Art of Indian Asia' (vol. I pp. 129-130) observes 'such living forms are suggested to the Indian artist by a dynamic philosophy that is intrinsic to his religious and philosophical tradition, for the worship of the life-force pouring into the universe and maintaining it, manifesting itself no less in the gross matter of daily experience than in the divine beings of religious vision constitutes the very foundation of Indian religious life. According to this doctrine which was particularly influential in the great periods of Indian art, release from the bondage of our normal human imperfection can be gained not only through the world-negating methods of asceticism (yoga) but equally through a perfect realization of love and its sexual enjoyment (bhoga). According to this view which has been eloquently expressed in the so-called Tāntric symbols and rituals of both the Hindu and Buddhist traditions, there is intrinsically no antagonism between *yoga* and *bhoga*. The role played by the guru, the spiritual guide and teacher in the stern masculine disciplines of yoga, is

---

1761. निधाय धारां वदने सुधायाः श्रीचक्रमभ्यर्च्य कुलक्रमेण। आस्वाद्य मद्यं पिशितं मृगाक्षीमालिङ्ग्य मोक्षं सुधियो लभन्ते॥ आस्वादयन्तः पिशितस्य खण्डमाकण्ठपूर्णं च सुधां पिबन्तः। मृगेक्षणासङ्गसमाचरन्तो भुक्तिं च मुक्तिं च वयं व्रजामः॥ verses 4 and 7 of कौलरहस्य, D. C. ms. No. 959 of 1884-87 copied in संवत् 1790, i. e. in 1734 A. D. This may be compared with the doctrine of the नीलपटदर्शन quoted above (p. 1073). There is a ms. in the BORI at Poona (D. C. No. 994 of 1891-1895) called पञ्चमकारशोधनविधि, which describes the sanctifications of five makāras with Vedic mantras on the same lines as the महानिर्वाणतन्त्र cited above.

taken over in the initiations of bhoga by the devout and sensual helpmate. The initiating woman plays the part of Śakti while the male initiate assumes that of Śiva and both attain together to the realisation of the immanence within themselves of the consubstantiality of the Goddess and the God.' It has already been stated (p. 1054) that Prof. Zimmer is wrong in thinking that the Tāntrik rites were systematically disparaged as 'vāmamārga' by the Indian partisans of Yoga. He is also wrong (p. 130) when he says that 'throughout the first millenium A. D. they (Tāntric rites) were a basic element of normal Indian experience.' There is really very little evidence to substantiate this claim. He makes this sweeping generalisation as an art-critic and historian of Indian Art from the few tāntric sculptures on the Purī and other temples in Orissa and some other places in India. Vide the well-known work 'Bengal Lancer' by F. Yeats-Brown (London, Golancz, 1930) pp. 236–237, where the superintendent of the temple of Jagannātha justifies the obscene frescoes on the ground that until a man is master of his gross body he cannot see the Godhead and feels sure that future ages will look on Tāntrik psychology with understanding.

One or two very peculiar notions and practices of the Tāntrikas may be briefly mentioned here. The offering of flesh, wine and mudrā to the *devatā* with the recital of three *bījas* 'āṅ, hrīm, krom' and the mantras 'om Ānandabhairavāya namaḥ' and 'om Ānandabhairavyai namaḥ' was technically called *śuddhi* [1762]. The Mahānirvāṇa and Tantrarāja-tantra state that to drink wine without *śuddhi* [1763]

1762. शुद्धिं विना मद्यपानं केवलं विषभक्षणम्। चिररोगी भवेन्मन्त्री स्वल्पायुर्म्रियतेऽचिरात्॥ महानिर्वाण० VI. 13. Sir John Woodroffe offers the rather amusing explanation that wine without food produces greater injury and that *japa* of mantra and the performance of other rites were believed by the sādhakas to remove the curse from wine and that the sādhaka meditates upon the union of the Goddess and God Śiva in the wine, the latter being itself a devatā. सत्यत्रेताद्वापरेषु यथा मद्यादिसेवनम्। कलावपि तथा कुर्यात् कुलवर्त्मानुसारतः॥ कुलमार्गेण तत्त्वानि शोधितानि च योगिने। ये दद्युः सत्यवचसे नहि तान् बाधते कलिः॥ महानिर्वाण० IV. 56–60.

1763. The कुलार्णव (17. 25) defines वीर as 'वीतरागमदक्लेशकोपमात्सर्यमोहतः। रजस्तमोविदूरत्वाद्वीर इत्यभिधीयते॥'. In spite of these requirements of high qualities the रुद्रयामल (in 28. 31–36) provides that a वीर should honour the beautiful wife of another (or 'his own wife or another's') wearing charming ornaments whose body is suffused with erotic passion and who has become

(*Continued on next page*)

was like swallowing poison, that the person doing so would suffer from diseases for a long time, would soon die prematurely and that wine was to be drunk even by one who has attained some perfection only up till the mind has reached an ecstatic state of absorption (in thoughts of Devī) and that if he drinks beyond that stage he at once becomes a sinner (vide also Kulārṇava VII. 97–98 for the last proposition).

A most revolting rite from the view-point of all unsophisticated people is what is called 'cakra-pūjā' (worship in a circle). An equal number of men and women without distinction of caste and even near blood relations secretly meet at night and sit in a circle (vide Kaulāvalīnirṇaya VIII. 76). The Goddess is represented by a *yantra* (diagram). There is a leader of the cakra. The regulations were that only persons who had attained the status of *Vīra* (defined above in n 1763) were to be admitted[1764] and *paśus* (ordinary men with beastly passions not curbed) were to be excluded. What assurance was there that the leader of the cakra himself possessed the noble qualities mentioned in the verse quoted above and would choose only men possessed of similar qualities? The women assembled cast their bodices in a receptacle and each of the assembled men secured a female companion for that night by lot i. e. by taking a bodice out of those contained in the receptacle. The practice of

---

(Continued from last page)

gay with wine 'अथ वीरो यजेत्कान्तां परकीयामथापि वा। ... मदनानलतप्ताङ्गीमासवानन्दविग्रहाम्। &c. The महानिर्वाण॰ I. 57 refers to the three categories of साधक viz. पशु, वीर and दिव्य, the last being defined as दिव्यश्च देवताप्रायः शुद्धान्तःकरणः सदा। द्वन्द्वातीतो वीतरागः सर्वभूतसमः क्षमी॥ (*ibid.* I. 55). The Tantras contain conflicting views on these three bhāvas. The Kālīvilāsa-tantra says that men of divya type existed only in Satya-yuga and Tretāyuga, Vīra only in Tretā and Dvāpara and these two were non-existent in Kali and Paśu-bhāva remained in Kali (VI. 10 and 21).

1764. Vide 'Śakti and Śākta' p. 354, Farquhar's 'Outlines of the religious Literature of India' p. 203, महानिर्वाणतन्त्र VIII. 204–219. श्रीचक्रवृत्तान्तं शुभं वा यदि वाशुभम्। कदाचिन्नैव वक्तव्यमित्याज्ञा परमेश्वरि॥ कुलधर्मविवेकं सर्वं सर्वावस्थासु सर्वदा। गोपयेच्च प्रयत्नेन जननीजारगर्भवत्। वेदशास्त्रपुराणानि स्पष्टानि गणिका इव। इयं तु शाम्भवी विद्या गुप्ता कुलवधूरिव॥ कुलार्णव XI. 79, 84, 85. In the महानिर्वाण (IV. 79–80), however, Śiva is made to say that the Kaulika-sādhana should be made openly and that what he said in other tantras about the concealment of Kaulikadharma not being blamable was not applicable when the Kali age became powerful.

Śrīcakra must have given rise to great obloquy and unpopularity for the Tāntrikas. Therefore, the Kulārṇava[1765] advises that cakrapūjā should be *sub rosa*. 'What happens at Śrīcakra, whether good or bad, should never be uttered (in public); this is the order (of God); one should never give out information about what happens at Cakrapūjā'. The 18th century Mahānirvāṇatantra, which is reformist in character, states that, since in the Kali age (in which people are weak and the influence of sinful age is very strong), for the last tattva (i. e. maithuna) one's own wife is alone to be the Śakti because in that case no fault can be found or some substitute like red sandalwood paste may be employed. In the author's youth whispers floated about that in some towns in Mahārāṣṭra cakrapūjā was practised, that even great Pandits thought that their learning was due to the favour of Devī, that they, though very orthodox in other respects, took once a year in Devīpūjā a thimbleful of wine as *prasāda*. The learned Achyutarāya[1766] Modak of Nasik composed at Nasik a work called 'Avaidikadhikkṛti' (condemnation of non-vaidika practices) wherein he severely handled the cult of the five makāras.

Naturally common people, who could not appreciate or understand the abstruse and subtle philosophy of Śakti, Nāda, Bindu and so forth, seized with avidity upon the apparently easy path of worship of Śakti by the five makāras and the mantras, bījas, cakras and the like taught by the Tantras and it has been seen above (pp. 1073–76) to what depths some persons professing to be gurus, Śāktas and Tāntrikas descended in course of time.

The path of the Tantras was in its higher level one of *Upāsanā* or *Bhakti*, though it very often degenerated into magic and moral depravity. The deity worshipped viz. Parameśvarī

1765. शेषतत्त्वं महेशानि निर्वीर्ये प्रबले कलौ। स्वकीया केवला ज्ञेया सर्वदोषविवर्जिता॥ अथवात्र स्वयम्भ्वादि कुसुमं प्राणवल्लभे। कथितं तत्प्रतिनिधौ कुसीदं परिकीर्तितम्॥ महानिर्वाण० VI. 14–15; अत्र means 'in offering शेषतत्त्व' (i. e. the 5th). The com. explains 'कुसीदं रक्तचन्दनम्'. Women that could be śaktis were of three classes, स्वीया (one's own wife), परकीया (wife of another) and साधारणी (a woman who is a *veśyā*).

1766. Vide for Achyutarāya Modak 'Taraporevalá Commemoration volume' of the Deccan College Research Institute, pp. 214–220. The work was finished at Pañcavaṭī in śaka 1736 Phālguna bright half 10th (i. e. in 1815 A. D.).

presented three aspects to the *upāsaka*[1767] (devotee) viz. gross (sthūla), subtle (sūkṣma) and para (highest). The first aspect is represented by the form of Devī with hands, feet and other limbs, which is fit for worship with the hands and the eyes of the devotee; the second aspect consists of mantras, which are fit for apprehension with the organs of hearing and speech by those who have the good fortune to receive the mantras from a worthy guru. The third aspect (*para*) is one to be apprehended by the mind of the sādhaka and described as all-pervading consciousness and the like (in Nityāṣoḍaśikā VI. 49–50).

Some modern writers have been somewhat unjust to the whole Tāntrik literature in labelling it all as black magic or as full of obscenities. The present writer is not one of those who sometimes hold that what is not understood is either false, absurd or non-existent. He is prepared to believe that the end and aim of a few of the higher minds among Tāntrikas and of some of the works on Tantra was the attainment of high spiritual powers by Yoga practices, the Realization of the Supreme Tattva (Principle) variously designated as *Brahma*, Viṣṇu, Śiva or Devī, and Liberation (mokṣa). He is aware that many of these claim to be based on Vedic traditions, teachings and practices and to have further developed the conceptions underlying Vedic teachings and ritual and that even the magic rites contained in several Tāntrik works had their counterparts, though on a much smaller scale, in the Ṛgveda, the Atharvaveda, Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa and other Vedic works. The present author, though he has carefully studied many of the Tantras and the Yogasūtra of Patañjali with the bhāṣya and commentaries thereon, has to admit that he has had no mystic experience, but he is not prepared to deny that prophets, saints, poets and others might have mystic visions and experiences. Man's psychic powers are vast

---

1767. अथात्रोपास्यायाः परमेश्वर्यास्त्रीणि रूपाण्युपास्तियोग्यानि स्थूलं सूक्ष्मं परं चेति। तत्राद्यं करचरणाद्यवयवशीलं मन्त्रसिद्धिमतां चक्षुरिन्द्रियपाणीन्द्रिययोर्योग्यम्। ततः पद्मनिभां देवीं बालार्ककिरणारुणाम्, इत्यादिना वक्ष्यमाणम्। द्वितीयं मन्त्रात्मकं पुण्यवतां श्रवणेन्द्रियवागिन्द्रिययोर्योग्यम्।... तृतीयं वासनात्मकं पुण्यवतां मनसो योग्यं — चैतन्यमात्मनो रूपम् — इत्यादिना षष्ठे पटले वक्ष्यमाणम्। एतास्त्रितयातीतं तु वाङ्मनसातीतं शुक्तैरक्षंतयाऽनुभूयमानमखण्डं रूपम्। सेतुबन्ध on नित्याषोडशिका॰ pp. 7–8. The words चैतन्यमात्मनो रूपम् occur in नित्याषोडशिका॰ VI. 50 p. 213. नित्या is 'श्रीपरमशिवाभिन्ना शक्तिरेव सावधित्येत्युच्यते।' सेतुबन्ध on p. 25. The नित्याषोडशिका॰ (I. 138–160) contains a finely worded description of the gross aspect of Devī beginning with the half verse 'ततः पद्मनिभां देवीं बालार्ककिरणारुणाम्.'

and unknown as propounded in Alexis Carrell's work 'Man the unknown' and in 'Invisible influence' by Dr. Alexander Cannon (15th impression, Rider and Co., London, 1935). He knows that some of the Tāntrik works made a distinction between the rules of ordinary social life and conventions (samājā-dharma) and the peculiar forms of Tāntrik worship, in which, while it lasts, no distinction is made on the ground of caste or sex (vide notes 1711 and 1713). It may further be conceded that the Tantra works placed women on a footing of equality with men, gave them an exalted position and that they endeavoured to provide a common platform (as shown in *n.* 1704 above) for differing and wrangling sects of Vaiṣṇavas, Śaivas and others by putting forward Devī as the object of worship for all; but they had not much success as is shown by the facts that Vaiṣṇavas and Śaivas still carried on their quarrels and that the Tāntrik texts themselves fell into five classes, viz. Śaiva, Śākta, Vaiṣṇava, Saura and Gāṇapatya and that there are differing doctrines among the Tāntrikas called Kādimata, Hādimata &c.

The matters that distinguish Tāntrik works from other religious literature in Sanskrit are the [1768] promise of the attainment of miraculous powers, the Realization of the one Supreme Principle in a short time by means of the Tāntrik *sādhanā* 'method or procedure' (vide Intro. to 'Principles of Tantra' p. XIV), by their insistence on the worship of Devī with makāras alone as yielding the desired results (as in Mahānirvāṇa V. 24 'pañcatattva-vihīnāyām pūjāyām na phalod-

---

1768. Sir John Woodroffe remarks (in the Introduction to his 'Principles of Tantra' part 2, pp. XII–XIV) that the one topic that appears to differentiate Tantras from other religious works is the constituent parts of its ritual such as the mantras, bījas, mudrās, yantras, *bhūtaśuddhi* and that it is mainly by these items rather than by anything else that the tāntrik character of a work is established. Vide also 'the Śāktas' by E. A. Payne p. 137 for a similar view. Sir. John Woodroffe, while reviewing Payne's work (in JRAS for 1935 at p. 387), himself agreed that what distinguished the Śākta ritual is the mantra and magical sections and that part of it which deals with the secret ritual, that, while there is ordinarily no *bhoga* (enjoyment) where there is *yoga*, in the Śākta doctrine a man may have both *yoga* and *bhoga* and that this is a distinct and profound characteristic of that doctrine. Even the Buddhist Vajrayāna Tantras purport to aim at the attainment of *bodhi* (vide Guhyasamāja p. 154, Sādhanamālā I. p. 225 and II. p. 421) and ज्ञानसिद्धि I. 4 ये तु सत्त्वाः समाख्याताः सर्वसङ्कल्पवर्जिताः । ते स्पृशन्ति परां बोधिं जन्मनीहैव साधकाः ॥.

bhavaḥ') and on their peculiar ritual of mantras, bījas (syllables meaningless to ordinary men), nyāsas, mudrās, cakras, yantras and similar things for attaining their goal. The condemnation poured on Tāntricism is principally due to their insistence on wine, meat and sexual unions as the best and the only means for the effective worship of Devī, their theory that by merely repeating some mantra or mantras over wine, meat and other tattvas, by offering them to Devī and by meditation on her, one may drink wine or eat meat, when in the same breath they say emphatically that partaking of wine and meat is sinful without this ritual. This antagonizes those who are not *kaulas* and who hold that this persistent teaching is very dangerous for the common run of men and savours of hypocrisy.

Some of the Tantras practically inculcated what appears to non-tāntrikas unbridled licence. The Kaulāvalī-nirṇaya (IV. 15 ff) asserts: 'The Śāktas have no higher means of happiness and liberation than the fifth tattva (i. e. maithuna); a sādhaka becomes *siddha* only by the (practice) of the fifth tattva. If he resorts only to the first (i. e. wine) he becomes only Bhairava, if only to the 2nd (meat) he becomes Brahmā, by the third (fish) he becomes a mahābhairava, by the 4th (mudrā) he becomes foremost among sādhakas.[1769] The same Tantra goes further and frankly says 'all women are fit for intercourse to a (Śākta) worshipper except the wives of his guru or of those Śāktas who have attained to the status of *Vīra*, that for those who have reached the stage of *advaita* there is no prohibition nor is anything enjoined. To the pure everything is pure, it is only the hankering that is blamable.' In this connection that work advances certain puerile and obscene arguments (in VIII. 223-225) about illicit or incestuous intercourse that cannot be set out here. That tantra does not stand alone in such statements. For example, the Kālīvilāsatantra (X. 20-21) allows adulterous intercourse to a 'Śākta' devotee pro-

---

1769. अथातः संप्रवक्ष्यामि पञ्चतत्त्वविनिर्णयम्। पञ्चमात्तु परं नास्ति शाक्तानां सुखमोक्षयोः। केवलैः पञ्चमैरेव सिद्धो भवति साधकः। केवलेनाद्ययोगेन साधको भैरवो भवेत्। &c. कौलावलीनिर्णय IV. 15-16; गुरुवीरवधूस्त्यक्त्वा रम्याः सर्वाश्च योषितः। एता वर्ज्याः प्रयत्नेन सन्दिग्धानां च सर्वदा॥ अद्वैतानां च कुत्रापि निषेधो नैव विद्यते।... अत एव यदा यस्य वासना कुत्सिता भवेत्। तदा दोषाय भवति नान्यथा दूषणं क्वचित्॥ कौलावलीनिर्णय VIII. 221-222, 226; पवित्रं सकलं चैव वासना कुत्सिता भवेत्। ibid. XVII. 170. दीक्षितः परनारीषु यदि मैथुनमाचरेत्। न बिन्दोः पातनं कार्यं कृते च ब्रह्महा भवेत्। यदि न प्रपतेद् बिन्दुः परनारीषु पार्वति। सर्वसिद्धीश्वरो भूत्वा विहरेद् भूमिमण्डले॥ कालीविलासतन्त्र X. 20-21.

vided it is not carried to the last stage of emission and avers that, if he observes the condition in the proviso, he would become the master of supernatural powers in spite of adultery. It should be noted that the author of this work has unabashed hardihood to make Śiva tell this to Pārvatī. About wine that work remarks 'just as drinking of soma [1770] is prescribed for brāhmaṇas is solemn Vedic sacrifices, similarly wine should be drunk at proper times (or according to the practice of Kaulas), since it confers enjoyment as well as mokṣa; drinking wine is blamable in the case of those who hanker after benefits or who are egoistic; but in the case of those that are free from egoism there is neither prohibition (of drinking) nor the enjoining of it. One who is free from the fetters of making distinctions should practise drinking wine for the purpose of remembering the meaning of the mantras and for making his mind fixed (on worship) but he who resorts to wine, and other tattvas merely for pleasure is sinful.' The teachings of works like the Kaulāvalī-nirṇaya about drinking wine and sexual intercourse with all sorts of women as the highest means of Śakti worship by persons professing to be *advaitins* led to great depravity and sexual immorality and orgies as indicated by the criticism in medieval works cited above (pp. 1073–76) that regarded Tāntrik teachings as execrable, though some medieval Hindu works admitted into religious practices nyāsa, mudrā, yantra and the like, which were deemed to be innocuous and which would be described in this work later on. The mere intention of doing good if certain conditions were fulfilled is not enough excuse, when it is most likely that the means proposed for attaining a high spiritual level and for liberation would have the opposite effect on most people. Taking all things into consideration, the present author is constrained to observe that medieval and recent writers who severely criticized Tāntrik works were on the whole largely justified in their condemnation of Tāntrik practices as enunciated in many Tāntrik works and of the works themselves. For one man that attained super-normal powers, high spiritual level and great mystic experience there must have been hundreds of hypocrites, charlatans, and licentious men who deluded trustful and ignorant men and particularly women.

1770. यथा क्रतुषु विप्राणां सोमपानं विधीयते। मद्यपानं तथा कार्यं समये भोगमोक्षदम्॥ फलार्थिनामहङ्कारवतां दूषणमेव हि। निरहंकारिणां चैव न निषेधो न वा विधिः॥ कौलावली॰ VIII. 90–91; मन्त्रार्थस्मरणार्थं तु मनसः स्थैर्यहेतवे। भेदपाशविनिर्मुक्तो मद्यपानं समाचरेत्। सेवेत यः सुखार्थाय मद्यादीनि स पातकी॥ ibid. VIII. 74.

Only a few Purāṇas like the Devīpurāṇa, the Kālikā, the Devīmāhātmya in the Mārkaṇḍeya provide for the employment of some of the condemned makāras (madya, māṁsa, matsya) in the worship of the Great Goddess. From about the 6th or 7th century A.D. Purāṇas began to incorporate the special ceremonial characteristics of the Śāktas and Tāntrikas. Aparārka quotes a passage[1771] from the Devīpurāṇa wherein the qualifications of a *Sthāpaka* (one who performs Devapratiṣṭhā) are set out, viz. he would be the best Sthāpaka for establishing images of Devī and the Mātṛs, who knows the *vāma* (left or opposite) and the *dakṣiṇa* (right) path of worship, who has thoroughly mastered the veda relating to the Mātṛs (the Mother Goddesses), who is clever in the interpretation of Pañcarātra works and is proficient in the Tantras of the Mātṛs &c. The Kālikā-purāṇa devotes many chapters (54 ff) to the description of mantras, kavacas, mudrās, nyāsas &c. The Bhāgavatapurāṇa also and Agni[1772] 372.34 expressly say that the worship of gods and of Viṣṇu also is either *vaidikī*, *tāntrikī* or *miśrā*, the first and third being for the three higher varṇas and the tāntrikī for śūdras. The Bhāgavatapurāṇa refers to the worship of Keśava laid down in the Tantras for him who desires to cast out the knot (bondage or grief) of the heart. It (Bhāgavata) also mentions[1773] Vaidikī and Tāntrikī dīkṣā (in XI. 11. 37) and refers to the Tāntrik method of the aṅgas, upāṅgas, āyudhas and decorations in the worship of the Lord of Lakṣmī.[1774] Some of the Purāṇas and medieval nibandhas, however, fully utilized what Tantras had to say about mantras, japa, nyāsa, maṇḍala, cakra, yantra and

---

1771. यदपि देवीपुराणे—वामदक्षिणवेत्ता यो मातृवेदार्थपारगः। स भवेत्स्थापकः श्रेष्ठो देवीनां मातरा(तृका?) सु च। पञ्चरात्रार्थकुशलो मातृतन्त्रविशारदः। &c. अपरार्क p. 16, who then quotes Matsya 265. 1-5 for the qualifications of sthāpaka in which there is no reference to वाम, दक्षिण or तन्त्र. This and the quotations from the Bhāgavata indicate that the Matsya was composed some centuries before the देवीपुराण and भागवतपुराण.

1772. वैदिकस्तान्त्रिको मिश्रो विष्णोर्वै त्रिविधो मखः। त्रयाणामीप्सितेनैकविधिना हरिमर्चयेत्। अग्नि 372. 34.

1773. य आशु हृदयग्रन्थिं निर्जिहीर्षुः परात्मनः। विधिनोपचरेद् देवं तन्त्रोक्तेन च केशवम्॥ लब्धानुग्रह आचार्यात्तेन सन्दर्शितागमः। पिण्डं विशोध्य संन्यासकृतरक्षोऽर्चयेद्धरिम्॥ भागवत XI. 3. 47 and 49. Here पिण्डशोधन refers to the भूतशुद्धि prescribed in such तान्त्रिक works as महानिर्वाणतन्त्र (V. 93-105) and taken over in late medieval works like the पूजाप्रकाश pp. 129-133 and न्यास also is mentioned as a means of protection against evil.

1774. तान्त्रिकाः परिचर्यायां केवलस्य श्रियः पतेः। अङ्गोपाङ्गायुधाकल्पं कल्पयन्ति यथैव हि। भागवत XII. 11. 2.

similar matters. This will be illustrated later by some examples. Even for such a simple and common topic as the 16 upacāras of worship, the Varṣakriyā-kaumudī (p. 156) and Ekādaśī-tattva (p. 59) quote the Prapañasāra-tantra (VI. 41-42).

The Purāṇas and some smṛtis prescribe short mantras of five, six, eight, twelve, thirteen and more syllables as very efficacious for securing all objects. A few of them are set out in the note[1775] below. Medhātithi or Manu says that the word mantra primarily means a part of the Veda comprising Ṛgveda, Yajurveda and Sāmaveda, treated as such by those who have studied the Veda, and that expressions like "Agnaye svāhā"[1776] employed in rites like Vaiśvadeva are called mantras in a secondary sense by way of praise. The vedic conception was that a mantra has great potency and that it must be correctly repeated to secure the desired result, that a mantra defective as to accent or as to a letter or wrongly applied did not convey the meaning intended and that becoming a thunderbolt in the form of a word or words it destroys[1777] the *yajamāna*. Vedic mantras are

---

1775. Vide शारदातिलक I. 73 ff for references to mantras of five or more letters. A pañcākṣara mantra is नमः शिवाय (in लिङ्गपुराण I. 85); the same becomes a mantra of six letters when 'om' is prefixed. Other mantras of six letters are: ओं नमो विष्णवे (in वृद्धहारीतस्मृति VI. 213), ओं नमो हराय (in हेमाद्रि on व्रत vol. I. p. 227), श्रीरामरामरामेति (vide note 219 above) and two more on p. 434 under 'Ṣaḍakṣaramantra'; 'Khakholkāya namaḥ' is a ṣaḍakṣara mantra of Āditya quoted from भविष्यपुराण in हेमाद्रि (व्रत II. p. 521) and in Kalpataru on vrata p. 9 and 199 (in the latter it is called मूलमन्त्र under Nimbasaptamī, the description of which is taken from Bhaviṣya, Brāhmaparva, chap. 215 and 216); mantras of eight letters are: ओं नमो नारायणाय (in नारदपुराण I. 16. 38-39, ब्रह्मपुराण 60. 24, वराहपु. 120. 7), ओं नमो वासुदेवाय (in वैखानसस्मार्तसूत्र IV. 12, नरसिंहपु. 63 6, q. by अपरार्क, मत्स्यपु. 102. 4 q. by स्मृतिच. I. p. 182 as मूलमन्त्र); a mantra of twelve letters is ओं नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय (in नारदपु. I. 16. 38-39, नरसिंहपु. 7. 43); for a mantra of 13 letters about राम, vide note 219 above); mantras of 16 letters are गोपीजनवल्लभचरणं शरणं प्रपद्ये (in नारदपु. II. 59. 44) and ह्रीं गौरि रुद्रदयिते योगेश्वरि हुं फट् स्वाहा (in शारदा° IX. 99).

1776. मन्त्रशब्देन देवतोद्देशशब्दवान् स्वाहाकारान्तोऽग्नये स्वाहेत्येवमादिर्विवक्ष्यते। न ह्यग्नये मन्त्रा वैश्वदेवेषु विनियुक्तास्तेषु च मन्त्रत्वं प्रशंसयोच्यते। न तु स्वाध्यायेऽपठितानां मन्त्रत्वमस्ति। स्वाध्यायैकदेशः कश्चिदृग्यजुःसामात्मको वेदाध्यायिभिर्मन्त्र इति व्यवह्रियते। व्यवहारतश्च पदार्थावगमनम्। मेधातिथि on मनु III. 121 (in Dr. Jha's edition).

1777. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 347 and note 840, where verse 52 from the Pāṇinīyaśikṣā is quoted and the story of the result of wrong accentuation of the word 'indraśatruḥ' is briefly set out from Tai. S. II. 4. 12. 1 and Śat. Br. I. 6. 3. 8-16.

of four classes viz. *ṛk* (which is metrical), *yajus* (which has no restriction as to metre but which must be a sentence), a *sāman* (which is sung) and *nigada* (i. e. *praiṣa*, meaning words that are addressed by one person to another calling upon the latter to do a certain act, e. g. the words 'srucaḥ sammṛḍḍhi, prokṣaṇīr-āsādaya'. Nigadas are yajus in form but are distinguished from yajus by the fact that the former are loudly uttered, while a yajus is ordinarily recited in a low voice.[1778] The most sacred mantra is the Gāyatrī (Ṛg. III. 62. 10 'tat-savitur' &c). The Atharvaveda (XIX. 71. 1) calls it Vedamātā (the mother of the Veda). The Bṛahadāraṇyakopaniṣad (V. 14) contains a grand eulogy of the Gāyatrī.[1779] *Om* is a very sacred syllable, a symbol of *brahma* and may be called in the language of the Tantras a bīja. There are only a few syllables such as *om*, *phaṭ*, *vaṣaṭ* in the Vedic literature that on the face of them have no meaning but are like *bīja* mantras in the Tantra sense. There is a *Bījanighaṇṭu* (a dictionary of bīja mantras) printed in 'Tāntrik texts' Vol. I. pp. 28–29 (where monosyllabic bījas such as Hrīm, Śrīm, Krīm, Hum, phaṭ, are set out and described in symbolic words indicated in note 1708 above. It is stated about a dozen times in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa viz. it is the perfection of sacrifice when it is *rūpasamṛddha* (perfect as to its form) i. e. when the ṛk verse pointedly refers to the sacrificial act that is being performed.[1780] The Nirukta (I. 15–16) starts a lengthy discussion on Kautsa's view that mantras have no sense (or are purposeless). There is a lông discussion in the Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtra (I. 2. 31 ff) on the same lines as in the Nirukta. Jaimini states that there is no difference in the meanings of words employed in the Veda and those employed by people and Śabara adds in his *bhāṣya* (on P. M. S. I. 2. 32) that mantras are recited in sacrifices only for the purpose of conveying or manifesting the meaning.[1781] It is difficult to

1778. Vide Jai. II. 1. 35–45 and H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 983–984 and note 2232 for further details about these.

1779. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 302–304 for the meaning and eulogies of Gāyatrī in various Sanskrit works and pp. 301–302 for the eulogy of 'om', which is called 'praṇava'.

1780. एतद्वै यज्ञस्य समृद्धं यद्रूपसमृद्धं यत्कर्म क्रियमाणमृगभिवदति। ऐ. ब्रा. III. (अध्याय), 5 (खण्ड).

1781. The Nirukta (I. 16) quotes this Brāhmaṇa passage but reads ऋग्यजुर्वाभिवदतीति in its discussion on the question whether Vedic mantras are significant. The words of the Ait. Br. 'yat karma kriyamāṇam ṛgabhivadati'

(*Continued on next page*)

define what a vedic mantra is and it is generally understood, as said by Śabara, that passages or verses are mantras that are recognised as such by the learned.[1782] The whole Veda is divided into five categories viz. *Vidhi* (hortatory passages as in 'Agnihotram juhuyāt'), *mantras*, *nāmadheya* (names such as Udbhid in 'Udbhida yajeta' or 'Viśvajit' as in 'Viśvajitā yajeta'), *niṣedha* (prohibition as in 'nānṛtam vadet') and *arthavāda* (explanatory or laudatory passages as in 'Vāyu is a deity that is swiftest'). The Nirukta (I. 20) embodies the ancient view that the sages had an intuitive perception of Dharma and they transmitted the mantras by oral instruction to those that came after them and that had no intuitive perception of Dharma. The *mantras* and *stotras* were supposed even in the Ṛg. to induce the gods to come to the sacrifices and to bestow on those who recited them protection, valiant sons, cattle, wealth, victory and all sorts of things (e. g. vide Ṛg. I. 102. 1-5, II. 24. 15-16, II. 25. 2, III. 31. 14, IX. 20. 7, IX. 72. 9, X. 78. 8, X. 105. 1). It has been shown above p. 920 (in notes 4167-4168) how the Purāṇas prescribed their own mantras for many religious acts but those mantras also are significant and not meaningless.

Mantras are the very heart and core of Tantraśāstra so much so that the śāstra is often spoken of as mantraśāstra. The theory of Tāntrik writings such as the Prapañcasāra and Śāradātilaka about mantras may be briefly stated as follows: In the human body there are ten nāḍīs, the three principal being Iḍā (on the left side from the left testicle to the left nostril), Suṣumnā (in the middle of the body in the spinal chord) and Piṅgalā (on the right side from the right testicle to the right nostril). The Kuṇḍalinī lies asleep coiled like a snake in the Mūlādhāra-cakra. It is a form of the *śabda-brahma*. The Devī (or Śakti) assumes the form of Kuṇḍalinī, all gods reside in Devī and all mantras are Her forms (Śāradātilaka I. 55-57). It has already been stated how from contact with light (Jyotiḥ) Śakti becomes conscious and has a desire to create, then it solidifies and appears as a *bindu*. Through the instrumentality

---

(*Continued from last page*)

contain the same doctrine that the PMS and Śabara emphasize viz. mantras are 'arthapratyāyaka' or 'arthaprakāśaka'. शबर on अविशिष्टस्तु वाक्यार्थः (पू. मी. सू. I. 2. 32) says 'अर्थप्रत्यायनार्थमेव यज्ञे मन्त्रोच्चारणम्'.

1782. अनाम्नातेषु मन्त्रत्वमाम्नातेषु हि विभागः। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 34 on which Śabara remarks 'अनाम्नातेषु मन्त्रत्वं न स्यादभिधायकेष्वपि। नाभिधायकत्वं मन्त्रत्वे हेतुः किं तर्हि। अभियुक्तप्रयोगः। येऽभियुक्तैर्मन्त्रा इति नोच्यन्ते न ते मन्त्राः॥'.

of Kāla (Time) bindu divides itself into three, gross (i. e. bīja), subtle (sūkṣma i. e. nāda which is bījabindu) and *para* (i. e. bindu which is kāryabindu). This last is of the nature of an unmanifest sound and is called *śabdabrahma*[1782a] by the sages (Śāradātilaka I. 11–12, Prapañcasāra I. 41 ff). Śabdabrahma exists in all things as consciousness; it exists in the bodies of living human beings in the form of Kuṇḍalinī and then appears as letters in prose, poetry and so forth, being carried by Vāyu (air) to the throat, palate, teeth &c. The sounds thus produced are called *akṣaras* and when written they are spoken of as *varṇas* (letters of the alphabet, mātṛkā, which are 50 from *a* to *kṣa*). The impulse to sound production arising in mūlādhāra-cakra is called 'parā' (vāk), it is called paśyantī when it reaches 'svādhiṣṭhāna-cakra, madhyamā in the heart and vaikharī in the mouth. Both akṣara and varṇa are Kuṇḍalinī made articulate in speech and visible in writing. All the *mantras* (some say they are nine crores) are evolved from the varṇas of the alphabet that are deemed (by Tāntrikas) to be living conscious sound powers. It is the bīja mantras like hrīm, śrīm, krīm that make visible the form of the Devatā (Mahānirvāṇa V. 18-19).[1783] It is wrong to suppose that mantras are mere letters or words or language. They assume different forms, such as bīja-mantras, kavaca, hṛdaya &c. The bījamantras like Hrīm (representing Tribhuvaneśvarī or Māyā), Śrīm (representing Lakṣmī), Krīm (representing Kālī) cannot possibly be called language, since they convey no meaning to ordinary men. They are the Devatā (Iṣṭadevatā of the

---

1782 a. देवी is described in शारदातिलक I. 56–57 as शब्दब्रह्मस्वरूपिणी and पञ्चाशद्वर्णरूपिणी.

1783. ताराद्या कमलाद्या च वाग्भवाद्या यथाक्रमम्। ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियविशां सावित्री कथिता कलौ॥ ... द्विजादीनां प्रभेदार्थं शूद्रेभ्यः परमेश्वरि। सन्ध्येयं वैदिकी प्रोक्ता प्रागेवाह्निककर्मणाम्॥ महानिर्वाण॰ VIII. 87–88. ओम् is called तार, श्रीं is कमलाबीज and ऐं is वाग्भवबीज. About गायत्री the शारदा॰ (XXI. 1–3) says 'अथो वक्ष्यामि गायत्रीं तत्त्वरूपां त्रयीमयीम्। यया प्रकाश्यते ब्रह्म सच्चिदानन्दलक्षणम्। प्रणवाद्या व्याहृतयः सप्त स्युस्तत्पदादिकाः। चतुर्विंशत्यक्षरात्मा गायत्री शिरसान्विता॥ सर्ववेदोद्धृतः सारो मन्त्रोऽयं समुदाहृतः॥. For the seven व्याहृतिs, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 301 note 713. Each is to be repeated preceded by *om*. The शिरस् of गायत्री is ओमापो ज्योती रसोऽमृतं ब्रह्मभूर्भुवः स्वरोम्।. The विष्णुधर्मोत्तर I. 165 says about गायत्री 'अभिचारेषु तां देवीं विपरीतां प्रयोजयेत्॥ कार्या व्याहृतयश्चात्र विपरीताक्षरास्तथा। विपरीताक्षरं कार्यं शिरश्च मनुजेश्वर॥ आदौ शिरः प्रयोक्तव्यं प्रणवान्ते च यादव। स्वाहास्थाने च फट्कारं साध्यनामसमन्वितम्। गायत्रीं चिन्तयेत्तत्र दीप्तानलसमप्रभाम् ... अभिचारे च होतव्या राजिका विषमिश्रिताः॥ स्वरक्तमिश्रं होतव्यं कटुतैलमथापि वा। अल्पागसि न कर्तव्यमभिचारं तथैव तु॥ महापराधं बलिनं देवब्राह्मणकण्टकम्। अभिचारेण यो हन्यात्र स दोषेण लिप्यते॥ verses 55–63.

sādhaka, the worshipper) imparted to the sādhaka by the qualified guru at the time of dīkṣā (initiation). They are not efficacious if merely learnt by reading books. A mantra according to Tāntrik works is the sound body of Śakti charged with the vibrations of the spiritual personality of the original Tāntrika seer of the *mantra* and endowed with a perpetual store of power by the Tāntrik seer. What is needed to awaken Power in the disciple and to reap the full effect of the mantra is the touch of the *guru*, the imagination and concentrated will power of the sādhaka. The deity willed that certain letters uttered by the seer should as sound or sounds convey such and such a meaning and should have a certain potency. The sounds represented by the letters are forms of Śivaśakti i. e. *Śabdabrahma*. From this last the whole world proceeds in the form of sounds (śabda) and the objects (*artha*) which sounds or words denote. The Devatā, the mantra and the guru are the essentials of *sādhanā* (procedure that leads on to Siddhi, laid down in Tāntrik works); the disciple has to revolve in his mind that the three are non-different. Mantra is not the same thing as a prayer. For a prayer a person may employ any words that he may choose, but in the case of a mantra definite letters are considered necessary, which are deemed to be the forms in which Śakti manifests Herself to the worshipper. A mantra may be in the form of words that have an obvious meaning or in the form of letters arranged in a particular order and that have no meaning to the uninitiated. It is recognised in some of the works on this śāstra that thought has creative power, that each person is Śiva, and can attain to higher and higher spiritual levels depending upon his ability to realise himself as Śiva. Thoughts are real, kind thoughts will do good to ourselves and to those around us, evil thoughts and wishes of others may cause us suffering.

Tāntrik works have their own mantras and they also employ Vedic mantras. For example, the mantra 'Jātavedase sunavāma' (Ṛg. I. 99. 1), though addressed to Agni, is employed in later works for invoking Durgā, the mantra 'Tryambakam yajāmahe' (Ṛg. VII. 59. 12) is addressed to Rudra, but is called Mṛtyuñjaya-mantra or mṛtasañjīvinī mantra in Tāntrik works and is prescribed for purifying the mind (*cittaśuddhi*) in the Mahānirvāṇa (VIII. 243). Similarly, the Gāyatrī mantra (Ṛg. III. 62. 10) is employed by the Tāntrikas. Vide Śāradātilaka XXI. 1-8 and 16 (latter for *dhyāna* of Gāyatrī) and Prapañcasāra, which

devotes the whole chapter 30 to the explanation of *om*, the *vyāhṛtis* and the words of the Gāyatrī and Gāyatrī-sādhana). The Mahānirvāṇa prescribes the performance of Vaidikī *sandhyā* to be followed by the Tāntrikī *sandhyā*. The Tāntrikī Gāyatrī is 'Ādyāyai vidmahe Parameśvaryai dhīmahi । tan-naḥ Kālī pracodayāt ॥' (Mahānirvāṇa V. 62–63). Even Śūdra Tāntrikas were to recite this last, while the three higher classes were to repeat the vedic Gāyatrī employing *om*, *śrīm* and *aim* before it respectively. The importance of guru, mantra and devatā is emphatically brought out in the following verse 'the person, who considers guru as a mere mortal, a mantra as mere letters and images (of deities) as mere stones falls into Hell.'[1784] The Rudrayāmala says 'If Śiva is angered, Guru can save (the pupil), but if Guru is angered, no one can save (the pupil)'.

The Paraśurāmakalpasūtra, Jñānārṇavatantra, the Śāradātilaka and almost all Tāntrika works say that mantras possess wonderful and inconceivable powers,[1785] that a follower of Tantra secures all powers by following the practices of the school of his guru traditionally handed down and by faith, that mantras are the means of securing the fruits desired, that the authoritativeness of Tantraśāstra depends mainly on the faith of the followers of the śāstra; that the sādhaka should come to feel that guru, mantra, the deity, his own soul, mind and life-breaths are all one and then he will possess the knowledge of the Highest Self. Some ot the Tāntrik works contain most exaggerated praises of mantras, particularly the śrīvidyāmantra of sixteen letters; e. g. Jñānārṇava says 'Even crores of Vājapeyas and thousands of Aśvamedhas are not equal (in merit) to even the utterance of Śrīvidyā and so also gifts of crores of Kapilā cows cannot be compared to one utterance of *Śrīvidyā* (24th

---

1784. गुरौ मनुष्यबुद्धिं च मन्त्रे चाक्षरबुद्धिकम्। प्रतिमासु शिलाबुद्धिं कुर्वाणो नरकं व्रजेत्॥ कुलार्णव XII. 45, कौलावलीनिर्णय X. 12–13; रुद्रयामल (II. 65) says 'गुरुः पिता गुरुर्माता गुरुर्देवो गुरुर्गतिः। शिवे रुष्टे गुरुस्त्राता गुरौ रुष्टे न कश्चन॥' This verse occurs in कुलार्णव 12. 49 (reads गुरुर्देवो महेश्वरः).

1785. मन्त्राणामचिन्त्यशक्तिता। संप्रदायविश्वासाभ्यां सर्वसिद्धिः। विश्वासभूयिष्ठं प्रामाण्यम्। गुरुमन्त्रदेवतात्ममनःपवनानामैक्यनिष्फालनादन्तरात्मवित्तिः। परशुरामकल्पसूत्र I. 7–11; अकारादिक्षकारान्ता मातृका पीठरूपिणी। ... ककारादिक्षकारान्ता वर्णास्तु शिवरूपिणः। पञ्चाशद्वर्णरूपेण शब्दाख्यं वस्तु सुव्रते। ... ज्ञानार्णवतन्त्र I. p. 1; मातृकावर्णभेदेभ्यः सर्वे मन्त्राः प्रजज्ञिरे। मन्त्रविद्याविभागेन त्रिविधा मन्त्रजातयः॥ ... पुंमन्त्रा हुंफडन्ताः स्युर्द्विठान्ताश्च स्त्रियो मताः। नपुंसका नमोन्ताः स्युरित्युक्ता मनवस्त्रिधा॥ शारदा° II. 57 and 59. Vide p. 118 note 305 where the verse 'चिन्मयस्य &c' is quoted; राघवभट्ट quotes it on शारदा° II. 59.

paṭala, verses 74-76). Vide Agnipurāṇa 125. 51-55 for mantras employed in killing an enemy, chapters 134 and 135 for Trailokyavijayavidyā and Saṅgrāmavijayavidyā respectively.

Numberless mantras are contained in the Tantras made from different arrangements of the constituent parts of a mantra. The Mahānirvāṇa first gives a mantra of ten syllables as noted below and then by different arrangements of the letters and by addition of certain other syllables and words like 'Kālike' it forms twelve mantras, remarks that there are crores of mantras and that the mantras contained in all Tantras are all mantras of the Great[1786] Devī.

The word *mantra* is explained as derived from 'man' to think and 'trai' or 'trā'. Yāska's Nirukta (VII. 12) derives it simply from 'man'. The Kulārṇava says 'mantra' is so called since it saves from all dangers, as the *sādhaka* thereby is led to ponder over God of immeasurable refulgence that is the only principle (in the world)'. A similar derivation is given by Rāmapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣad, by the Prapañcasāra and other Tantras.[1787] Numerous varieties of mantras called Kavaca, Hṛdaya, Upahṛdaya, Netra, Astra, Rakṣā and so forth are specified in the Tāntrik texts, one or two of which may be illustrated in the note below and the rest are passed over for reasons of space.[1788]

1786. The mantra of ten syllables in महानिर्वाण॰ V. 10-13 is ह्रीं श्रीं क्रीं परमेश्वरि स्वाहा. Then it proceeds : 'तव मन्त्रा ह्यसंख्याताः कोटिकोट्यर्बुदास्तथा। ... येषु येषु च तन्त्रेषु ये ये मन्त्राः प्रकीर्तिताः। ते सर्वे तव मन्त्राः स्युस्त्वमाद्या प्रकृतिर्यतः॥ महानिर्वाण॰ V. 18-19.

1787. क्रियाकर्मेज्यकर्तॄणामर्थं मन्त्रो वदत्यथ। मननात् प्राणनान्मन्त्रः सर्ववाच्यस्य वाचकः॥ रामपूर्वतापिनीय-उप. I. 12; दद्याच्च दिव्यभावं क्षिणुयाद् दुरितान्यतो भवेद्दीक्षा। मननात्तत्त्वपदस्य त्रायत इति मन्त्रमुच्यते भयतः॥ प्रपञ्चसार V. 2; मननात्तत्त्वरूपस्य देवस्यामिततेजसः। त्रायते सर्वभयतस्तस्मान्मन्त्र इतीरितः॥ कुलार्णव 17. 54.

1788. The ब्रह्माण्डपुराण III. 33 provides for a मन्त्र of ten syllables, 'गोपीजनवल्लभाय स्वाहा' together with ऋषि, छन्दस्, देवता and विनियोग 'गोपीजनपदस्यान्ते वल्लभाय समुच्चरेत्। स्वाहान्तोयं महामन्त्रो दशार्णो भुक्तिमुक्तिदः॥ सदाशिवस्त्वस्य ऋषिः पङ्क्तिश्छन्द उदाहृतम्। देवता कृष्ण उदितो विनियोगोऽखिलाप्तये॥' verses 3-4. Then the कवच called त्रैलोक्यविजय is described in verses 5-27 beginning with त्रैलोक्यविजयस्याथ कवचस्य प्रजापतिः। ऋषिश्छन्दश्च जगती देवो राजेश्वरः स्वयम्। त्रैलोक्यविजयप्राप्तौ विनियोगः प्रकीर्तितः। प्रणवो मे शिरः पातु श्रीकृष्णाय नमः सदा। पायात्कपालं कृष्णाय स्वाहेति सततं मम॥ कृष्णेति पातु नेत्रे मे कृष्ण स्वाहेति तारकाम्।... क्लीं कृष्णाय नमः कर्णौ पातु कल्पतरुर्मम। श्रीं कृष्णाय नमः पातु नित्यं मेऽधरयुग्मकम्॥ ... इति ते कथितं भूप सर्वाघौघविनाशनम्। त्रैलोक्यविजयं नाम कवचं परमेशितुः। &c. For a comparatively modern कवच of आद्या कालिका, vide महानिर्वाणतन्त्र VII. 56-65, and नारदपु॰ II. 56. 48-50 for a कवचमन्त्र beginning with पूर्वे मां पातु गोविन्दो ... भूतले पातु वाराहस्तथोर्ध्वे च त्रिविक्रमः॥ (in four दिशाs, 4 कोणदिशाs, पाताल and ऊर्ध्व with different names of विष्णु).

The Śāradātilaka divides mantras into male, female and neuter; masculine mantras end in 'hum' and 'phaṭ', female mantras in 'svāhā' and neuter mantras end with 'namaḥ'. This is stretched further so as to apply to letters viz. the vowels ṛ ṝ, ḷ ḹ are said to be neither and the rest are said to be not neuter but only short and long (Śāradātilaka, VI. 3 and Rāghavabhaṭṭa thereon). Śāradātilaka (from chap. VII to XXIII) is devoted to mantras of Sarasvatī, Lakṣmī, Bhuvaneśvarī, Tvaritā and others, Durgā,[1789] Tripurā, Gaṇapati, Candramas. Many of the mantras are to be repeated thousands of times or *lakhs* of times in order to secure full effect. For example, in X. 105–107 the Śāradātilaka prescribes that a certain mantra should be repeated five lakhs of times and then fifty thousand āhutis of ghee should be made and worship of the Devī with the procedure prescribed should be performed. The worshipper then secures whatever he may desire and can make kings sub-servient to his will. Another noticeable feature is that the mantras are treated like the mantras of the Veda and mention is made in the manner of the Anukramaṇīs of the sage, the metre, the deity and the viniyoga (or purpose for which it is to be used or employed). Though the Śāradātilaka is a sober work free from the sexual practices of Vāmamārga, still it does contain mantras for magical purposes such as bringing women under control (IX. 103–104, X. 76),[1790] bringing about the paralysing or the death of an enemy by mantras (XI. 60–124, XXI. 95 XXII. 1 ff).

The Buddhist Tantras did not lag behind the Hindu Tantras in the matter of the potency of mantras. The Sādhanamālā[1791]

1789. The दुर्गामन्त्र is 'ओं ह्रीं दुं दुर्गायै नमः' (शारदा° XI 1-2) and then the work proceeds ऋषिश्च नारदश्छन्दो गायत्रं देवता मनोः। दुर्गा समीरिता सद्भिर्दुरितापनिवारिणी॥ (XI. 3); दुरितापनिवारिणी refers to the विनियोग; about the monosyllabic mantra 'śrīm' these are set out as follows; बीजमेतच्छ्रियः प्रोक्तं चिन्तामणिरिवापरः। ऋषिर्भृगुर्निचृच्छन्दो देवता श्रीः समीरिता॥ शारदा° VIII. 2–3.

1790. मूलमन्त्रं जपेन्मन्त्री नित्यमष्टसहस्रकम्। सप्ताहाद्वाञ्छितां नारीमाहरेत्स्मरविह्वलाम्। शारदा° IX. 103–104; सिद्धं मन्त्रं जपेन्मन्त्री सहस्रं शयनस्थितः। यां विचिन्त्य स्त्रियं रात्रौ सा समायाति तत्क्षणात्। *ibid.* X. 76. मूलमन्त्र would be ह्रीं श्रीं क्लीं.

1791. किमस्त्यसाध्यं मन्त्राणां योजितानां यथाविधि। साधनमाला p. 575; ओं आः ह्रीं हुं हैं हः अयं मन्त्रराजो बुद्धत्वं ददाति किं पुनरन्याः सिद्धयः। *ibid.* p. 270; यातु किं बहु वर्णनीयं परमतिदुर्लभं बुद्धत्वमपि तेषां पाणितलावलीनबदरकफलमिवावतिष्ठति। *ibid.* p. 62. ओम् चलचल चिलिचिलि चुलुचुलु कुलुकुलु मुलुमुलु हुंहुंहुंहुं फट्फट्फट्फट् पद्महस्ते स्वाहा दिने दिने पञ्चवारान् त्रिसन्ध्यमुच्चारयेत्। गर्दभोपि ग्रन्थशतत्रयं गृह्णाति। *ibid* p. 87; the

(*Continued on next page*)

asserts that there is nothing that cannot be accomplished by mantras if proper procedure is followed. For example, it says that a certain mantra that is a prince among mantras confers Buddhahood, what need is there to say about othere siddhis, that by another mantra even Buddhahood which is extremely difficult to attain is like a jujube fruit placed on the palm of the hand and that a certain mantra (of unmeaning words) if repeated five times at three periods in the day viz. the morning, noon and evening, makes even a fool (lit. an ass) master of three hundred works. The Buddhist Tantras also prescribe repetition of mantras for a lakh[1792] of times (vide Sādhanamālā, vol I, No. 165

(Continued from last page)

सद्धर्मपुण्डरीकसूत्र chap. 21 (B. I. series ed. by Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, 1952) contains several धारणीs (Talismanic sentences), one of which may be cited here (p. 267) 'अथ खलु बोधिसत्त्वो ... इमानि धारणीमन्त्रपदानि भाषते स्म। तद्यथा। ज्वले महाज्वले उक्के तुक्के मुक्के अडे अडावति नृत्ये ... इट्टिनि विट्टिनि ... नृत्यावति स्वाहा'.

1792. ओं मणिधारे हुं। लक्षजापेनार्या अग्रत उपतिष्ठति। यदिच्छति तत्सर्वं ददाति। विना मण्डलकस्नानोपवासेन केवलं जापमात्रेण सिध्यति सर्वं कार्यं च साधयति। साधनमाला vol. I. p. 221. आर्या here means Goddess Tārā. The most famous mantra among Buddhists is 'Om Maṇipadme hūm' where 'maṇipadme' is vocative (and probably refers to Tārā deity, who has a jewel lotus). Vide Dr. F. W. Thomas in JRAS for 1906 p. 464. It is often rendered as 'Hail, the jewel lotus'. While these pages were passing through the press the present author *received a work called 'Foundations of Tibetan mysticism' according to the* Esoteric Teachings of the Great Mantra 'Om Maṇi Padme Hūṁ' by Lama Anagarika Govinda (pub. by Rider and Co. London, 1959). It is impossible to deal with this work in this note. He states that the Mantra 'Om' &c. is dedicated to Avalokiteśvara (a fine photographic plate of whom occurs as the Frontispiece). None who is not a confirmed Tibetan Buddhist scholar or monk will accept his interpretations of the words of the mantra. On p. 27 he states that the mantra is pronounced in Tibet as 'Oṁ Maṇi Peme Hūṁ' and that the complete formula is 'Oṁ... Hūṁ, Hrīḥ' (p. 230); on pp. 84 ff. he scouts the idea that tāntrism is a Hinduistic reaction taken over by later Buddhist schools. He offers different esoteric meanings of the words of the mantra, e. g. on p. 130 he says 'oṁ is the ascent towards universality, Hūṁ is the descent of the states of universality into the depth of the human heart'; on p. 131 'Oṁ is the infinite, but Hūṁ is the infinite in the finite, the eternal in the temporal' &c.; on p. 230 'In the Oṁ, we experience the *Dharmakāya* and the mystery of the universal body, in 'maṇi' the *Sambhogakāya*, in the Padma we experience the Nirmāṇakāya, in the Hūṁ we experience the *Vajrakāya* as synthesis of the transcendental body of the three mysteries; in the Hrīḥ, we dedicate the totality of our transformed personality to the service of Amitābha; on p. 256 'thus Oṁ...Hūṁ embodies the happy tidings of liberation, of the love towarde all living beings and of the way that leads to final realization.' The present author is constrained to say that by similar arbitrary interpretations the words of any mantra may be made to yield similar senses.

p. 336 and No. 108. p. 221). Some of the mantras embody the doctrines of Mahāyāna with the addition of syllables like om, phaṭ, svāhā (such as 'om śūnyatā-jñānavajrasvabhāvātmakoham' in Sādhanamālā vol. I. p. 62). The Prapañcasāra, which is ascribed to the great advaita teacher Śaṅkarācārya and on which Padmapāda is said to have written a commentary (both published by A. Avalon in Tāntrik Texts, vol. XVIII–XIX, 1935), contains a mantra called Trailokya-mohana for the purpose[1793] of the six cruel magic rites and (in 34. 33) describes a *yantra* (diagram) by worship of which a sādhaka can make a woman smitten with passion for him and draw her to him. This, among other matters such as ungrammatical forms, raises grave doubts as to whether the work was really composed by the first Śaṅkarācārya. It may, however, be stated that the learned Rāghavabhaṭṭa in many places in his commentary on the Śāradātilaka (such as I. 7, 8, 12) quotes the Prapañcasāra (I. 42, 44) as the great ācārya's work and several later writers do the same. It has to be borne in mind, however, that about 400 works are ascribed to the great advaita Ācārya and that Rāghavabhaṭṭa was separated by at least seven centuries from the great Ācārya and his ascription therefore cannot be accepted with implicit faith without more evidence.

Several Purāṇas are affected by the theory about the power of mantras of the Tāntrika type. The Garuḍa-purāṇa (I. chap. 7 and 10) employs many monosyllabic unmeaning mantras like hrām, kṣaum, hrīm, hum, huḥ, śrīm, hrīm and says (I. 23) that 'om Khakholkāya Sūryamūrtaye namaḥ' is the mūlamantra of the Sun and this mantra is employed for sun-worship in an early digest like the Kṛtyakalpataru on vrata (p. 9 note). The Bhaviṣya-purāṇa (Brāhmaparva 215. 4) gives 'Khakholkāya namaḥ' as the mūlamantra in Sun worship. The Bhaviṣya (Brāhma. 29. 9-15) provides that 'gam svāhā' is the mūlamantra of Gaṇapati worship, cites the mantras for *hṛdaya*, śikhā, kavaca &c. and a Gāyatrī suited to Gaṇapati.[1794] Garuḍa I. 38 contains a long prose mantra of Cāmuṇḍā. The Agni-

---

1793. मारणोच्चाटनद्वेषस्तम्भाकर्षणकांक्षिणः । भजेयुः सर्वथैवेनं मन्त्रं त्रैलोक्यमोहनम् ॥ प्रपञ्चसार XXIII. 5. Vide शक्तिसङ्गमतन्त्र VIII. 102–105 and जयाख्यसंहिता 26th पटल, verse 24 for the same. Agni-purāṇa Chap. 138 deals with the six cruel acts.

1794. गं स्वाहा मूलमन्त्रोयं प्रणवेन समन्वितः । गां नमो हृदयं ज्ञेयं गीं शिरः परिकीर्तितम् । शिखां च गूं नमो ज्ञेयं गैं नमः कवचं स्मृतम् । गौं नमो नेत्रमुद्दिष्टं गः फट् कामास्त्रमुच्यते । भविष्य (ब्राह्म 29. 9 ff). The गायत्री is महाकर्णाय विद्महे वक्रतुण्डाय धीमहि । तन्नो दन्तिः प्रचोदयात् ॥ (*ibid*. 29. 15).

purāṇa also contains many mantras of the Tāntrik type. Chap. 121 verses 15–17 provide[1795] for a mantra whereby enemeis are brought under control (as noted below) and verses 17–19 speak of a mantra for paralysing (*stambhana*) of an enemy. Chap. 133–135 of the Agni contain several mantras of the Tāntrik type. Chapter 307 contains several mantras of bringing under control the three worlds.

A mantra called Mahāśvetā is spoken of in the Bhaviṣya-purāṇa which is mentioned in the Kṛtyakalpataru on vrata (p. 9) and in Ekādaśītattva p. 40 and it is 'hrām hrīm saḥ' and the japa of that mantra on Sunday with fast is said to yield what one desires.[1796]

The later medieval digests on Dharmaśāstra adopt the Prāṇapratiṣṭhā mantra evolved by the Śāradātilaka (XXIII. 71–76). The Devapratiṣṭhā tattva[1797] (pp. 506–507) quotes these verses from Śāradātilaka, sets out the mantra and explains the verses at length. The Divyatattva also (pp. 609–610) does the same. The Vyavahāramayūkha (p. 86) sets out the same mantra for the consecration of the image of Dharma in the ordeal of Dharma without expressly naming the Śāradātilaka. The Nirṇayasindhu (pp. 349–350) has an elaborate rite of the Prāṇapratiṣṭhā of images full of Tāntrik elements like the words vaṣaṭ, hrīm, and phaṭ and employs the same procedure as the one prescribed by the Śāradātilaka without expressly mentioning the latter. The Śāradātilaka appears to follow earlier works like the Jayākhyasaṁhitā (Paṭala XX) and Prapañcasāra-tantra (35. 1–9 ff).

1795. पार्थिवे चाष्टह्रींकारं मध्ये नाम च दिक्षु च॥ ह्रीं पुटं पार्थिवे दिक्षु क्रीं दिक्षु लिखेद्बहून्। गोरोचनाकुङ्कुमेन भूर्जे बद्धे गले धृतम्॥ शत्रवो वशमायान्ति मन्त्रेणानेन निश्चितम्। अग्नि. 121. 15–17.

1796. उपवासं च ये कुर्युरादित्यस्य दिने तथा। जपन्ति च महाश्वेतां ते लभन्ते यथेप्सितम्॥ महाश्वेतामन्त्रस्त्वागमे। ह्रामित्युक्त्वा ततो ह्रीं तु सकारश्च विसर्गवान्। महाश्वेताख्यमन्त्रोऽयं भानोस्त्र्यक्षर ईरितः॥ ए. त. p. 40. The verse उपवासं च is quoted by कृ. on व्रत vol. II. part 2 p. 520.

1797. तेनायं मन्त्रः। आं ह्रीं क्रों यं रं लं शं षं सं हों हंसः अमुष्य प्राणा इह प्राणाः। अमुष्य जीव इह स्थितः। अमुष्य सर्वेन्द्रियाणि। अमुष्य वाङ्मनश्चक्षुःश्रोत्रघ्राणप्राणा इहागत्य सुखं चिरं तिष्ठन्तु स्वाहा। देवप्रतिष्ठातत्त्व pp. 506–507. अमुष्य refers to the name of the divinity whose image is to be established. If it is a Goddess then the words अमुष्याः or अस्यै are to be substituted. The तन्त्रराजतन्त्र (XIII. 62–68) sets out the प्राणप्रतिष्ठाविद्या of 40 letters from अमुष्य to स्वाहा in the technical language of Tāntrik works.

Reasons of space preclude further illustrations of the use of Tāntrik mantras by medieval digests on Dharmaśāstra. One matter of contrast between Vedic mantras and some Tāntrik mantras may be noticed. A Vedic mantra, according to Jaimini (I 2. 32), was significant, but the Tantras go so far as to teach the repetition of mantras that have no meaning or that contain the letters of the mantra in reversed form. For example, the Kālīvilāsatantra (XXII. 21) says that the reverse of the three letters of the mantra 'om Durge', as 'rgedu om' yields all desires ('rgedu om tryakṣaram mantram sarvakāmaphala-pradam)'. The Sad-dharmapuṇḍarīka[1798] (a standard work of Mahāyāna Buddhism) chap. 21 (text edited by Kern and Bunyiu Nanjiu, 1912 and translated in S. B. E. vol. XXI. pp. 370–375) contains spells (called Dhāraṇīpadāni). It should not be supposed that spells were peculiar to Hindus or Buddhists. Many ancient peoples believed that words and letters have magic power and that belief led on to another belief that it did not matter even if the letters and words had no sense. E. J. Thomas in 'History of Buddhist thought' (reprint of 1953) states that spells similar to Hindu and Buddhist types exist in old English, Old High German and Keltic (p. 186).

The repetition of mantras, Vedic as well as Tāntrik, is called 'Puraścaraṇa'[1799] (which literally means 'performing or carrying out before'). The Mahānirvāṇa (VII. 76–85) sets out various modes of puraścaraṇa (brief as well as elaborate). One way is to bring together five *tattvas* on the 14th tithi of a dark fortnight or on a Tuesday or Saturday, then the Devī is to be worshipped and the worshipper is to repeat ten thousand times with single-mindedness the mantra in *mahāniśā* (midnight), then he is to feed persons devoted to *brahman* and becomes one who has carried out puraścaraṇa. Another way is that he should repeat every day one thousand times the mantra beginning on a Tuesday up to (including) the next Tuesday, so that by repeating the mantra in all eight thousand times on eight days,

1798. A very brief spell from the सद्धर्मपुण्डरीक may be set out here by way of sample: ज्वले महाज्वले उक्के मुक्के अडे अडावति ... स्वाहा। p, 372 of SBE vol. XXI which is quoted above in note 1791. All the words excluding स्वाहा are in the vocative. उक्के, for उल्के, ज्वले for ज्वाले.

1799. Puraścaraṇa of a mantra has several constituent elements viz. dhyāna (meditation on the form of the deity to be worshipped), worship, japa of the mantra, homa, tarpaṇa, abhiṣeka and feeding brāhmaṇas. In a brief puraścaraṇa the first three alone are included. Tarpaṇa means satiating with water the deity and the pitṛs.

he will be deemed to have performed puraścaraṇa. Sometimes, it is prescribed[1800] that a mantra such as 'Śivāya namaḥ' (this is five-lettered mantra) or 'Om Śivāya namaḥ' (a ṣaḍakṣara mantra) should be repeated 24 lakhs of times and the sādhaka should offer into Agni twenty-four thousand *āhutis* of *pāyasa*. Then the mantra becomes perfect and confers on the sādhaka whatever he desires. The Kulārṇava states that Puraścaraṇa is so called because by the five-fold *upāsanā* the deity desired (as if) moves[1801] before the worshipper for conferring on him her favour. A mantra like the Gāyatrī is[1802] to be repeated every day 1008 or 108 or 10 times. This requirement is in keeping with what the Purāṇas and Dharmaśāstra works say. For example, the Nāradapurāṇa (II. 57.54) provides that a mantra is to be repeated 8, 28, or 108 times. The Ekādaśītattva[1802] quotes Devīpurāṇa for the proposition that the offerings in the homa to planets should be 108, 28 or 8 according to one's ability.

Rāghavabhaṭṭa in his commentary on Śāradātilaka (16. 56) has a very exhaustive and learned note on the details of puraścaraṇa that are common to all mantras. According to the Vāyavīya-saṁhitā[1803] the perfecting of the procedure of the mūlamantra is called puraścaraṇa, since it has to be practised before the acts in which it is to be employed. The Kulārṇava[1804] provides that there are at least five constituent elements of puraścaraṇa viz. pūjā (worship of the desired deity) three times a day, japa (muttering of the mantra), *tarpaṇa*, homa, and

---

1800. हृदयं वपरं साक्षि लान्तामन्त्यान्वितो मरुत्। पञ्चाक्षरो मनुः प्रोक्तस्ताराद्योऽयं षडक्षरः॥ ... तत्त्वलक्षं जपेन्मन्त्रं दीक्षितः शैववर्त्मना। तावत्संख्यासहस्राणि जुहुयात्पायसैः शुभैः॥ ततः सिद्धो भवेन्मन्त्रः साधकाभीष्टसिद्धिदः। शारदा० 18. 2, 15-16. The first verse says that शिवाय नमः or ओं शिवाय नमः is the mantra of Śivā.

1801. पञ्चाङ्गोपासनेनेष्टा देवता प्रीतिदानतः। पुरश्चरति भक्तस्य तत्पुरश्चरणं प्रिये॥ कुलार्णव 17. 87.

1802. अष्टोत्तरं सहस्रं वा शतं वा दशधापि वा। जपानां नियमो भद्रे सर्वत्राह्निककर्मणि॥ महानिर्वाण VIII. 79; compare एकादशीतत्त्व pp. 59 होमसंख्यामाह देवीपुराणे। होमो ग्रहादिपूजायां शतमष्टोत्तरं भवेत्। अष्टविंशतिरष्टौ वा यथाशक्ति विधीयते॥.

1803. वायवीयसंहितायाम्। साधनं मूलमन्त्रस्य पुरश्चरणमुच्यते। पुरतश्चरणीयत्वाद्विनियोगाख्यकर्मणाम्। पुरतो विनियोगस्य चरणाद्वा तथोदितम्॥ राघवभट्ट on शारदा०; and सेतुबन्ध of भास्करराय p. 99 reads पुरतश्चर्यमाणत्वाद्विनियोगाद्धि.

1804. संसारे दुःखभूयिष्ठे यदीच्छेत्सिद्धिमात्मनः। पञ्चाङ्गोपासनेनैव मन्त्रजापी व्रजेत् सुखम्। पूजा त्रैकालिकी नित्यं जपस्तर्पणमेव च। होमो ब्राह्मणभुक्तिश्च पुरश्चरणमुच्यते। यद्यदङ्गं विहीयेत तत्संख्याद्विगुणो जपः। कुर्याद् द्वित्रिचतुःपञ्चसंख्यां वा साधकः प्रिये। ... सुभोजितेषु विप्रेषु सर्वं हि सफलं भवेत्। सम्यक्सिद्धैकमन्त्रस्य पञ्चाङ्गोपासनेन च। सर्वे मन्त्राश्च सिध्यन्ति त्वत्प्रसादात्कुलेश्वरि। कुलार्णवतन्त्र XV. 7-9 and 11-12 q. by राघवभट्ट.

dinner to brāhmaṇas; that if any one of these cannot be carried out, then he should perform japa of the mantra twice as many times more as the number prescribed for that constituent, that, in the absence of some constituents, by providing a good dinner to brāhmaṇas everything becomes successful and that if one mantra is perfected by performing the five constituents mentioned above, then he secures *siddhi* of all mantras. Rāghavabhaṭṭa suggests another way of puraścaraṇa viz. one should be pure,[1805] observe a fast and then in an eclipse of the sun or moon should stand in the navel-deep water of a river directly falling into the sea, should recite a mantra with concentration of mind from the time the eclipse begins till its end, thereafter perform homa and the rest in order reducing each to 1/10 of the number of japa recitation, then secure the guru's contentment (by gifts) and that by this method mantra becomes perfect and the deity becomes favourable. The Kaulāvalīnirṇaya describes (14th *paṭala*, verses 75-260) a terrible sādhanā whereby in a single night a sādhaka secures mantra-siddhi viz. by going to a cemetery or other lonely spot after one watch of the night, securing the corpse of a cāṇḍāla, or of one who is killed by some one with a sword or one bitten by a snake or a young handsome warrior dying in a battle (not killed by himself), he should wash the corpse, offer worship to it and to Durgā and repeat the mantra ('om Durge Durge rakṣaṇī svāhā'). If he is not frightened by the terrific sights that he may see and after following a very long procedure he secures *mantrasiddhi*. The Tārābhaktisudhārṇava (*taraṅga* IX pp 345 ff) describes the 'śavasādhana-vidhi' and so does the Kulacūḍāmaṇi-tantra (Tāntrik texts, vol. IV.) VI. 19-28.

Rāghavabhaṭṭa further quotes a passage[1806] to the effect that if the sādhaka satisfies his guru who is a form of the deity

---

1805. अथवान्यप्रकारेण पुरश्चरणमुच्यते। ग्रहणेऽर्कस्य चेन्द्वोर्वा शुचिः पूर्वमुपोषितः। नद्यां समुद्रगामिन्यां नाभिमात्रेऽम्भसि स्थितः। ग्रहणादि तु मोक्षान्तं जपेन्मन्त्रं समाहितः। अनन्तरं तद्दशांशक्रमाद्धोमादिकं चरेत्। तदन्ते मन्त्रसिद्ध्यर्थं गुरुं संपूज्य तोषयेत्। ततश्च मन्त्रसिद्धिः स्यात् देवता च प्रसीदति। q. by राघवभट्ट on शारदा॰ 16 56 and by स्मृतिकौस्तुभ (pp. 73-74); vide श. क्रि. कौ. pp. 109-110 where these verses (with slight variations) are quoted from आगम. Vide शक्तिसङ्गमतन्त्र (ताराखण्ड) 17. 40-45, some portion of which is 'चन्द्रग्रहे पुरश्चर्या सर्वसिद्धिकरी मता। यद्यदङ्गं विहीयेत तत्साङ्गे द्विजभोजनम्। दशांशं हवनं कुर्यात्तर्पणं तद्दशांशतः। मार्जनं तद्दशांशेन तद्दशांशेनाभिषेचनम्। यद्यदङ्गं विहीयेत तत्संख्याद्विगुणो जपः।'

1806. अथवा देवतारूपं गुरुं भक्त्या प्रतोषयेत्। पुरश्चरणहीनेपि मन्त्रः सिध्येन्न संशयः॥ ... पुरस्क्रिया तु मन्त्राणां प्रधानं बीजमुच्यते। येषां जपे च होमे च संख्या नोक्ता मनीषिभिः।

(*Continued on next page*)

worshipped, he would secure perfection of mantra even without puraścaraṇa, that puraścaraṇa is the main seed (cause) of (the perfection of) mantras, that where the number of times a mantra is to be recited is not expressly stated, it should be repeated 8000 times. Rāghavabhaṭṭa quotes a verse saying that just as a man in the grip of diseases is incapable of performing all actions a mantra devoid of puraścaraṇa is declared to be in a similar condition.

The Agnipurāṇa, Kulārṇava and Śāradātilaka lay down rules about the places where puraścaraṇa of a mantra is to be practised. The following places are commended[1807] for those who are engaged in perfecting a mantra, viz. holy places, river bank, caves, mountain top, ground near a *tīrtha*, confluence of rivers, holy forests and parks, the root of a *bilva* tree, mountain slopes, temple, seashore, one's own house or any place where the mind (of the sādhaka) feels happy. Rules were also laid down as to the food on which the sādhaka was to subsist during the days of puraścaraṇa viz. food[1808] obtained by begging for alms (for *brahmacārin* and *yati*), *haviṣya* food (prescribed for vratas), allowed vegetables, fruits, milk, bulbous roots, barley meal. The Mantramahodadhi (25. 66–71) sets out what is haviṣya food in śānti and proper food in the other cruel rites. Rāghavabhaṭṭa (on 16. 56) adds many rules from other sources, such as the sādhaka performing puraścaraṇa should avoid sexual intercourse, flesh, wine, should not speak with women and śūdras, nor speak untruth, nor pamper his senses, should carry on the *japa* from morning till noon, should not allow a break, should repeat the mantra the same number of times every day.

(*Continued from last page*)

तेषामष्ट सहस्राणि संख्योक्ता जपहोमयोः । राघवभट्ट on शारदा० 16. 56. The verse पुर... मुच्यते occurs in कौलावलीतन्त्र XII. 108 (reads प्रधानं जीव उच्यते). व्याधिग्रस्तो यथा देही सर्वकर्मसु न क्षमः । पुरश्चरणहीनोयं तथा मन्त्रोऽपि कीर्तितः । राघव० on शारदा० 16. 56. This mantra is q. by नित्याचारपद्धति of विद्याकर p. 454 (but reads जीवहीनो यथा०). साधकः साधयेन्मन्त्रं देवतायतनादिके। शुद्धभूमौ गृहे प्राच्यं मण्डले हरिमीश्वरम्। अग्निपु. 29. 1.

1807. पुण्यक्षेत्रं नदीतीरं गुहा पर्वतमस्तकम्। तीर्थप्रदेशाः सिन्धूनां सङ्गमः पावनं वनम्। उद्यानानि विविक्तानि बिल्वमूलं तटं गिरेः । देवतायतनं कूलं समुद्रस्य निजं गृहम्। साधनेषु प्रशस्तानि स्थानान्येतानि मन्त्रिणाम्। अथवा निवसेत्तत्र यत्र चित्तं प्रसीदति॥ कुलार्णव XV. 22–24, शारदा० II. 138–140 (except the last half verse); vide अहिर्बुध्न्यसंहिता 20. 52–53 for similar provisions.

1808. भैक्ष्यं हविष्यं शाकानि विहितानि फलं पयः । मूलं सक्तुर्यवोत्पन्नो भक्ष्याण्येतानि मन्त्रिणाम्। शारदा० II. 140–141; for हविष्य, vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. p. 149 note 343.

The Jayākhya-saṁhitā (19th paṭala, verses 13–33) says that, for three years after the sādhaka begins puraścaraṇa of the mantra chosen, various obstacles and disturbances present themselves but if his mind and action are not affected by them, then from the 4th year he comes to be served by disciples that surrender everything to him, that after seven years even proud kings approach him for favour, after the 9th year he notices many wondrous things such as joy, sound dreams, sweet music and fragrance,[1809] hears loud vedic recitation, he eats and sleeps little (yet does not become lean), that these are signs of his having reached perfection in the mantra. The same work provides that such signs he should not divulge to any one but his own guru and if he divulges those happy signs to others siddhis run away from him (19. 34–37). The same Saṁhitā (15. 186–188) provides that the syllables svāhā, svādhā, phaṭ, hum and namaḥ are to be respectively employed in homa, in rites for *manes*, destructive activities, creating hatred among friends and for securing *mokṣa*. All tāntrik works emphasize that mantra must be received from a qualified guru and the *sādhanā* of the mantra must be done under the guidance of the guru till the disciple himself becomes a *siddha*. As shown above it was believed that mantras would confer the highest spiritual and supernormal powers, would bring to the sādhaka all desired objects and mokṣa. The Kulārṇava states[1810] 'It it declared in the doctrine taught by Śiva that without dīkṣā there would be no mokṣa, that dīkṣā cannot be had without an *ācārya* (guru) and that mantras would yield no fruit unless a guru instructs (a disciple) about them'.

1809. The Yogasūtra III. 36 and bhāṣya thereon state that some of the powers developed are that the yoga expert hears divine music and receives the impression of fragrant scents. In 'Bengal Lancer' F. Yeats—Brown (London, 1930) narrates (pp. 246–247) how he had the experience that the room in which he and his American friends were sitting was filled by a yogic teacher who wore nothing but his *dhoti* with the perfume of *aṭṭar* of roses, then with the scent of violets, musk, sandalwood, with nothing else with him except cotton wool on which he focussed a magnifying glass. The Śv. Up. II. 13 details the first signs of the effectiveness of yoga practices 'लघुत्वमारोग्यमलोलुपत्वं वर्णप्रसादः स्वरसौष्ठवं च। गन्धः शुभो मूत्रपुरीषमल्पं योगप्रवृत्तिं प्रथमां वदन्ति ॥'.

1810. विना दीक्षां न मोक्षः स्यात्तदुक्तं शिवशासने। सा च न स्याद्विनाचार्यमित्याचार्यपरम्परा ॥ ... अन्तरेणोपदेष्टारं मन्त्राः स्युर्निष्फला यतः। कुलार्णव XIV. 3–4.

It was further provided[1811] that there was no siddhi (miraculous powers due to mantras) nor mokṣa for him who had not had dīkṣā performed for him, that therefore a man should by all means receive dīkṣā from a guru and that when one is endowed with the ceremony of dīkṣā the distinctions based on caste vanish and a śūdra and a brāhmaṇa cease to be so (when both have undergone dīkṣā). It was held that, if a person were to engage in the japa of a mantra written in a book, he would not secure siddhi and he would surely meet losses at every[1812] step.

In the Mahānirvāṇa (II. 14–15 and 20) it is said that Vedic mantras yielded desired results in Satya and other yugas, but in Kaliyuga they are like serpents without poison or like dead ones, that in the Kaliyuga the mantras declared in tantra works yield fruits quickly and are commended for employment in all actions such as *japa* and sacrifices. There is no such path as the one propounded in Tantras that would lead to mokṣa or to happiness in this world and the next. The Mahānirvāṇa prescribes that 'om sac-cid-ekam brahma' is the best of mantras (III. 14), that those who perform the upāsanā of the highest *brahma* are in need of no other sādhanā and that by the mere perfection of that mantra the individual soul merges in *brahma.*[1813] So *Mokṣa* was one of the aims. Another aim was the attainment of miraculous or supernormal powers. The Prapañcasāra enumerates[1814] the eight siddhis and states that one who is endowed with these eight is a liberated soul and is spoken of as a *yogin.* The theory of siddhis is an ancient conception and occurs in the Āpastamba-dharmasūtra.[1815] The eight siddhis are named and

---

1811. देवि दीक्षाविहीनस्य न सिद्धिर्न च सद्गतिः। तस्मात्सर्वप्रयत्नेन गुरुणा दीक्षितो भवेत्॥ गतं शूद्रस्य शूद्रत्वं विप्रस्यापि च विप्रता। दीक्षासंस्कारसम्पन्ने जातिभेदो न विद्यते॥ कुलार्णव XIV. 97 and 91.

1812. पुस्तकाल्लिखितो मन्त्रो येन सुन्दरि जप्यते। न तस्य जायते सिद्धिर्हानिरेव पदे पदे॥ q. by राघवभट्ट on शारदा० IV. 1.

1813. परब्रह्मोपासकानां किमन्यैः साधनान्तरैः। मन्त्रग्रहणमात्रेण देही ब्रह्ममयो भवेत्॥ महानिर्वाण III. 23–24. The मन्त्र is ओं सच्चिदेकं ब्रह्म and it is preceded by ऐं, ह्रीं or श्रीं according as विद्या, माया or श्री is to be worshipped (महानिर्वाण III. 35–37).

1814. अणिमा महिमा च तथा गरिमा लघिमेशिता वशित्वं च। प्राप्तिः प्राकाम्यं चेत्यष्टैश्वर्याणि योगयुक्तस्य॥ अष्टैश्वर्यसमेतो जीवन्मुक्तः प्रवक्ष्यते योगी। प्रपञ्चसार 19. 62–63. For a personal experience of levitation in modern times; vide 'The invisible influence' by Dr. Alexander Cannon (15th impression, 1935) chap. II, pp. 39–41. The कल्पतरु (मोक्षकाण्ड pp. 216–17) quotes a long prose passage from the ancient writer देवल who names and illustrates the eight siddhis or vibhūtis (omits गरिमा and adds यत्रकामावसायित्व).

1815. अथापि सङ्कल्पसिद्धयो भवन्ति। यथा वर्षं प्रजा दानं दूरे दर्शनं मनोजवता यच्चान्यदेवं युक्तम्। आप. ध. सू. II. 9. 23. 6–7.

explained in the Yogasūtrabhāṣya as follows[1816]: Aṇiman (becoming small like an atom, atomization), laghiman (levitation), mahiman (becoming magnified like a mountain or the sky, magnification), prāpti (all objects becoming near to him such as touching the moon with one's fingertip, extension), prākāmya (the non-obstruction of his desire such as diving into the earth *underground and coming up as if he were in water),* vaśitva (mastery of the five elements and their products such as a jar), īśitva (sovereignty over the production, absorption or arrangement of elements and their products), yatra-kāmāvasāyitva (the power to determine things according to his wish or will i. e. he may will that poison should have the effect of nectar and brings about that result). A siddha would be one who has secured these eight *siddhis*. The *Gītā* (*X. 26*) *says that the* sage Kapila is the great one among siddhas ('siddhānām kapilo muniḥ'). The Yogasūtra further speaks of siddhis as fivefold viz. proceeding from birth, from drugs, from mantras, from *tapas* (austerities) and from concentration. There were other objects also sought to be achieved by mantras, such as the six cruel rites and making women to have passion for a man. This shows that not only Tāntrikas, but those who practised yoga believed in the power of mantras to confer supernormal powers on the yogin. The Yogasūtra provides that some of the siddhis (as in III. 37) are obstacles to the attainment of *samādhi* and they are siddhis only to those who have awakened from *trance.*[1817] Yāj (*III. 202–203*) *provides* that the power to disappear, to enter another body and temporarily to abandon one's body, to create at one's will objects-these and other powers are characteristic signs of the attainment of siddhis by Yoga and that when one attains perfection in Yoga one can cast away the mortal coil and be able to become immortal in brahma.

A great deal is said about the six cruel rites in the Tantras such as Prapañcasāra (V), Śāradātilaka (23. 121–145), Śaktisaṅgamatantra (Kālīkhaṇḍa VIII. 102–106), Mantramahodadhi (25th Taraṅga). The Śāradātilaka (23. 137–141) deals with the six methods or arrangements of mantra along with the name of the enemy against whom the six rites were to be practised,

---

1816. विभूतिर्भूतिरैश्वर्यमणिमादिकमष्टधा। अमरकोश; ततोऽणिमादिप्रादुर्भावः कायसम्पद्धर्मानभिघातश्च। योगसूत्र *III. 44*; जन्मौषधि-मन्त्र-तपः-समाधिजाः सिद्धयः। योगसूत्र IV. 1. The भाष्य explains मन्त्रैराकाशगमनाणिमादिसिद्धिः.

1817. ते समाधावुपसर्गा व्युत्थाने सिद्धयः। योगसूत्र III. 37.

viz. the arrangements called *grathana, vidarbha, sampuṭa, rodhana, yoga* and *pallava*. These are all passed over here. But it appears that even the early Purāṇas were influenced by rites of black magic. For example, the Matsya[1818] says 'in *vidveṣaṇa* (creating enmity among friends or among those who love one another) and in *abhicāra*, a triangular kuṇḍa is recommended and homa should be offered in it by priests that wear red flowers and red sandalwood paste, that wear the sacred thread in the *nivīta* way, that put on red turbans and red garments, the fuel sticks should be smeared with the fresh blood of crows collected in three vessels and should be offered with the left hand holding the bones of a hawk. The priests should have their hair untied on the head and should contemplate the befalling of evil on the enemy; they should recite the mantra 'durmitriyās-tasmai santu' and also the syllables 'hrīm' and 'phāṭ' and having recited over a razor the mantra used in *śyenayāga*, the priest should cut into pieces an effigy of the enemy with that razor and throw into the fire the pieces of the effigy. This rite yields results only here (in this world), but no good results in the next world and therefore one (who engages in this rite) should then perform a śānti. The Matsya also provides for a rite for bringing a person (or a woman) under control or for *uccāṭana* (chap. 93. 139–148). It is possible that the Tāntrikas and the Matsya both developed their magic rites of six kinds from the Śyenayāga mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas and Śrautasūtras. The Agnipurāṇa (chap. 138) also deals with those evil rites. The Ahirbudhnya-saṁhitā, though mainly a work of the Pāñcarātra cult, is full of lore on mantras.[1819] In chap. 52 (verses

1818. विद्वेषणेऽभिचारे च त्रिकोणं कुण्डमिष्यते। ...होमं कुर्युस्ततो विप्रा रक्तमाल्याद्यनुलेपनाः। निवीतलोहितोष्णीषा लोहिताम्बरधारिणः। नववायसरक्ताढ्यपात्रत्रयसमन्विताः। समिधो वामहस्तेन श्येनास्थिबलसंयुताः। होतव्या मुक्तकेशैस्तु ध्यायद्भिरशिवं रिपौ। दुर्मित्रियास्तस्मै सन्तु तथा हुं फडितीति च। श्येनाभिचारमन्त्रेण क्षुरं समभिमन्त्र्य च। प्रतिरूपं रिपोः कृत्वा क्षुरेण परिकर्तयेत्। रिपुरूपस्य शकलान्यथैवाग्नौ विनिक्षिपेत्। ...इहैव फलदं पुंसामेतन्नामुत्र शोभनम्। तस्माच्छान्तिकमेवात्र कर्तव्यं भूतिमिच्छता॥ मत्स्य 93. 149–155. For 'nivīta' way of wearing Yajñopavīta, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 287–289 footnotes 673–674 and 679. In the तै. सं. I. 4. 4. 5 and तै. ब्रा. II. 6. 6. 3 occurs the mantra 'सुमित्रा न आप ओषधयः सन्तु दुर्मित्रास्तस्मै भूयासुर्योऽस्मान् द्वेष्टि यं च वयं द्विष्मः।.' श्येन was the name of an *abhicāra* (magic) rite (vide Jaimini I. 4.5 and Śābara thereon), was a modification of सोमयाग and in the texts about श्येन (viz. श्येनेनाभिचरन् यजेत) occur the words 'लोहितोष्णीषा लोहितवसना निवीता ऋत्विजः प्रचरन्ति' (आप. श्रौ. 22. 4. 13 and 23) q. by शबर on जै. X. 4. 1. Vide षड्विंश-ब्राह्मण III. 8. 2 and 22 for the same passages.

1819. पञ्चरात्रमयी दिव्या सांख्ययोगादिसंमिता। संहितेयं महाप्रज्ञा नानामन्त्रमयी परा॥ अहिर्बुध्न्यसं० 59. 70.

2-88) it deals with the linguistic occultism of such mantras as 'om namo Viṣṇave'. *It says that mantras have three senses* sthūla (gross), sūkṣma (subtle) and highest; chap. 51 explains these three about the Tāra or Tāraka mantra viz. Om.

It may be noted here that the Buddhist Tantras also claimed to show the way to the attainment of various objects, from success in love affairs to liberation and all these could be mostly secured by mantras. The Buddhist Tantra writers of the Vajrayāna school state that there were 84 *siddhas*, whose names are still cherished[1820] and honoured in Nepal and Tibet. The Buddhists mentioned eight siddhis but they were somewhat different from those of the Yogasūtra. The Sādhanamālā mentions them as follows: Khaḍga (a sword over which mantras have been muttered whereby the user of it succeeds in battle), Añjana (collyrium applied to eyes which enables a person to see buried treasure), Pādalepa (ointment applied to the soles of the feet enabling a person to move anywhere undiscovered), Antardhāna (becoming invisible before the very eyes of persons watching him), Rasarasāyana (power of transmitting baser metals *into gold or finding out an elixir for* immortality), Khecara (being able to fly up in the sky), Bhūcara (going swiftly anywhere on the earth) and Pātālasiddhi (diving underneath the earth[1821]). As the Buddhist monks were to possess no property, they had a craving for wealth and supposed that by means of certain mantras, the lord of wealth (Kubera) would confer on them riches that would last for ever.[1822] They also believed that by mantras they would make

1820. Vide Dr. Bhattacharya's 'Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism' pp. 84, 96 and 126 for references to 84 Siddhapuruṣas and 'Cultural Heritage of India' Vol. IV, pp. 273-279 on 'Cult of the Buddhist Siddhāchāryas' by Prof. P. C. Bagchi at p. 274 for the names of 84 Siddhas according *to* Tibetan tradition. The tradition of Siddhas continued right down to modern times; vide ABORI, Vol. 19 pp. 49-60 for the account of a brāhmaṇa called 'Śivayogi' of Sṛṅgārapura in the Ratnagiri District, who went from Koṅkaṇa to a siddha at Rāḍhā in Bengal, served him devotedly for a long time, himself became a Siddha, returned to his native place and built a monastery there. The हठयोगप्रदीपिका (I. 5-8) names about thirty Mahāsiddhas from Ādinātha (Śiva), Matsyendranātha, Gorakṣanātha, *Allamaprabhu and others.*

1821. खड्गाञ्जनपादलेपान्तर्धानरसरसायनखेचरभूचरपातालसिद्धिमष्टसाः सिद्धीः साधयेत्। साधनमाला No. 172 p. 350.

1822. एवंप्रकारैः सलिलप्रदानैः सन्तुष्टचित्तो द्रविणाधिराजः। ददेद्धनान्यक्षयशुचिभाविं तस्मात्प्रशो यत्नपरेण साध्यम्॥ साधनमाला No. 296 p. 580.

some of the Hindu gods their servants, viz. that they would be surrounded by many *apsarases* (heavenly damsels), that Indra would be their umbrella-bearer, Brahmā would be councillor and Hari door-keeper.[1823] They wanted to defeat opponents in public discussions and to acquire proficiency in Śāstras without study through the power of mantras alone (vide Sādhanamālā Nos. 151, 155, 256). They were also anxious to cure and avert diseases and remove snake poison. They thought that by mantras they would attain to omniscience and Buddhahood (vide notes 1791–92).

As stated above (notes 1810–11) a mantra had to be received from a guru after initiation (dīkṣā). Therefore, a few words must be said about dīkṣā. The Tāntrikas did not discover any new concept in dīkṣā. From very ancient Vedic times there was upanayana regarded as the beginning of the spiritual birth of a boy and the sacrificer had to undergo a purificatory ceremony before embarking on the performance of a sacrifice, but both were not so elaborate as the dīkṣā described in some of the Tāntrika works. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II pp. 1135–1140 for Vedic dīkṣā (in Agniṣṭoma), the observances and references to the Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras. The Tai. S. (VI. I. 1–3 and VII. 4. 8) refers to dīkṣā and the Ait. Br. (I. 3) mentions the main items in Vedic dīkṣā, such as bath with sacred water on the sacrificer, smearing the face and other parts of the body with butter, applying collyrium to the eyes, purification of the sacrificer's body twice by the *adhvaryu* with three bunches of seven *darbhas* each above the navel and then below it with mantras, entering a pavilion specially prepared for the sacrificer, covering him with a garment that envelopes him as a sack envelopes an embryo, dark antelope skin as an upper garment. The Śat. Br. also refers to the details of dīkṣā and states that thereby the sacrificer becomes one among the gods for the time being (vide III. 1. 2. 10–21, III. 1. 3. 7–28) and for the idea that dīkṣā symbolizes a new birth for the sacrificer. The Atharvaveda says 'Great truth, formidable moral order, vows of initiation, austerities, prayer (or knowledge) and sacrifice support the earth.'[1824]

1823. किं च भगवतो लक्षत्रयजापात् उभयचक्रवर्तिराज्यमासुखीभवति, अनेकाप्सरोभिः परिवृतः पुरस्कृतो विद्याधरस्थाने महलछत्रमङ्गभवनेव तिष्ठति, देवेन्द्रश्छत्रधरो भवति, ब्रह्मा च मन्त्री ... हरिः प्रतिहारः। साधनमाला No. 260 pp. 509–510.

1824. The शतपथ III. 2. 1. 19 and 22 is 'देवान्वा एष उपावर्तते यो दीक्षते स देवतानामेको भवति'; सत्यं बृहदृतमुग्रं दीक्षा तपो ब्रह्म यज्ञः पृथिवीं धारयन्ति। अथर्व XII. 1. 1.

Dīkṣā is treated elaborately in some of the Tantras such as Prapañcasāra (V and VI), Kulārṇava (14. 39 ff), Śāradātilaka (4th paṭala), Nityotsava (pp. 4–10), Jñānārṇava (24th paṭala), Viṣṇusaṁhitā (X), Mahānirvāṇa (X. 112–119) and in Liṅgapurāṇa (II. 21). The Nirṇaysāgara Press brought out an edition (in 1935) of a work called Dīkṣāprakāśikā of Viṣṇu-bhaṭṭa, pupil of Satyānandanātha, composed in śaka 1719 (1797 A. D.). Almost all of them derive[1825] the word from the root 'dā' (to give) and 'kṣi' to destroy, in various ways. The Kulārṇava defines it as 'the good call it dīkṣā because it confers a divine (holy) state and wipes off all sins, thereby freeing a man from the bondage of saṁsāra'; the Śāradātilaka states 'since it confers divine knowledge and destroys sins it is named dīkṣā by the teachers that know the Tantras.'

The Śaktisaṅgama-tantra regards an eclipse of the sun or the moon (particularly of the moon) as the best time for undergoing initiation for a mantra from a guru and remarks that when performed in an eclipse, the week day, *tithi*, *nakṣatra* or month or *Yoga* or *Karaṇa* need not be considered.[1826] The Kālīvilāsatantra states that if one is fortunate enough to secure Svātī nakṣatra and Friday on the 5th tithi of the dark half of Phālguna and undergoes dīkṣā on that date, that yields the rewards of a crore of ordinary dīkṣās (VI. 3–4). The N. S. (p. 67) quotes the Jñānārṇava to the effect that the dīkṣā as to a mantra should be on the day of a solar or lunar eclipse or within seven days from an eclipse and adds that the principal time is solar eclipse and quotes Kālottara to the effect that, if the time of a solar eclipse is secured for dīkṣā, one need not consider the month, tithi, the week day and the like. N. S. also quotes a passage from Yoginītantra condemning dīkṣā on a lunar eclipse. Vide Muhūrtakalpadruma of Viṭṭhala p. 94 verse 6 (Nirn. ed.) for further details about times and places for dīkṣā.

1825. दद्याच्च दिव्यभावं क्षिणुयाद् दुरितान्यतो भवेद्दीक्षा। प्रपञ्चसार V. 2; दिव्यभावप्रदानाच्च क्षालनात्कल्मषस्य च। दीक्षेति कथिता सद्भिर्भवबन्धविमोचनात्॥ कुलार्णव 17. 51 (here क्ष is said to represent क्षालन and not क्षय as in others); दिव्यज्ञानं यतो दद्यात्कुर्यात्पापस्य संक्षयम्। तस्माद्दीक्षेति संप्रोक्ता देशिकैस्तन्त्रवेदिभिः॥ शारदा॰ IV. 2.

1826. चन्द्रसूर्यग्रहे दीक्षा सर्वदीक्षाशुभा मता। चन्द्रग्रहे शक्तिदीक्षा सर्वदीक्षोत्तमोत्तमा। न वार-तिथि-नक्षत्रादि न मासनियमस्तथा। न योगकरणं चापि न विचारं समाचरेत्। शक्तिसङ्गम, ताराखण्ड 17. 36–38; मन्त्रदीक्षाप्रकारस्तन्त्रे द्रष्टव्यः। दीक्षाग्रहणमुपदेशस्याप्युपलक्षणम्। शुभे शुभे तु दीक्षासीदुपदेशः कलौ शुभे। चन्द्रसूर्यग्रहे तीर्थे सिद्धक्षेत्रे शिवालये। मन्त्रमात्रप्रकथनमुपदेशः स उच्यते। धर्मसिन्धु p. 32.

The Agnipurāṇa (chapters 27, 81–89 and 304) deals with dīkṣā at great length and is full of Tāntrik mantras and rites, but reasons of space forbid any treatment of the same here. The Jñānārṇava (24. 45–53) provides that at the time of initiation (dīkṣā) the guru has to instruct the disciple or novice as regards the six *cakras* (Ādhāra up to Ājñā) together with the number of petals in each, the colour of each, the letters of the alphabet assigned to each.

Late Dharmaśāstra works relied for the initiation into mantras on tantra works. For example, the Dharmasindhu (p. 32) expressly says so. There is a difference between Dīkṣā and *upadeśa*, which latter means the communication of only a mantra in a solar or lunar eclipse, at a tīrtha, Siddhakṣetra (sacred region once inhabited by a siddha) or in a Śiva temple. Raghunandana in Dīkṣātattva (vol. II. pp. 645–659) gives a lengthy treatment of dīkṣā at the beginning of which he remarks that in the Śāradātilaka and other works numerous topics of dīkṣā are described but as in his time all those were not being followed he attempts only a brief treatment.

The Mahānirvāṇa states (X. 201–202) that the guru for giving dīkṣā when the disciple is a Śākta, Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava, Saura or a Gāṇapatya, should be of the same sect, but a *kaula* is a good guru for every one. The Mahānirvāṇa (X. 112) provides that a person does not become a Kaula by merely drinking wine, but he becomes so only after *abhiṣeka*. Then (in verses 113–193 of 10th ullāsa) the Mahānirvāṇa provides an elaborate procedure of complete *abhiṣeka* somewhat resembling Christian Baptism. There is first on the day previous to the day of abhiṣeka worship of Gaṇeśa, then of eight Śaktis (Brāhmī &c.), lokapālas and their weapons. Then the next day (i. e. the day of abhiṣeka) after a bath the neophyte donates sesame and gold for the removal of all sins and approaches a guru with the prayer to perform abhiṣeka. Then the guru draws a *sarvatobhadra* maṇḍala on an altar, sanctifies the five tattvas, places an auspicious jar and fills it with wine or with holy water. The principal part consists in the guru's sprinkling with water the disciple to the accompaniment of 21 mantras (X. 160–180) invoking[1827] the gods Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, the Mātṛs, various Śaktis, the avatāras, the numerous forms of Devī, the dikpālas,

---

1827. One अभिषेकमन्त्र may be quoted for sample 'गुरवस्त्वाभिषिञ्चन्तु ब्रह्मा-विष्णुमहेश्वराः। दुर्गालक्ष्मीभवान्यस्त्वामभिषिञ्चन्तु मातरः॥' X. 160.

the nine planets, nakṣatras, *yogas*, weekdays, *karaṇas*, seas, sacred rivers, nāgas, trees &c. Then the guru gives the disciple a new name ending in Ānandanātha, who honours the guru and other Kaulas present. This ceremony may go on for 9, 7, 5, 3 nights or one night. Vide Tantrarājatantra II. 58–72, Jñānasiddhi (XVII) for similar procedure of abhiṣeka. Vide the Introduction to the Sekoddeśaṭīkā, a Buddhist Tāntrik work (in G. O. S.) edited by Mario E. Carelli, for its resemblance to the Christian rite of Baptism. The Ahirhudhnya-saṁhitā (chap. 39) provides a procedure of *Mahābhiṣeka* as one remedy against all diseases, as one destroying all enemies and for the attainment of all desired objects.

There were four kinds of dīkṣas, Kriyāvatī, Varṇamayī, Kalāvatī and Vedhamayī and there were elaborate rules about *vāstuyāga*, construction of maṇḍapa, kuṇḍas and sthaṇḍila, which are all passed over for reasons of space.

CHAPTER XXVII

Nyāsas, Mudrās, Yantra, Cakra, Maṇḍala, etc.

One of the important items in the Tāntrik ritual and worship is *nyāsa*, which means 'mentally invoking a god or gods, mantras and holy texts to come to occupy certain parts of the body in order to render the body a pure and fit receptacle for worship and meditation'. Several works such as the Jayākhya-saṁhitā (Paṭala XI), Prapañcasāra (VI), Kulārṇava (IV. 18 ff) refer to several kinds of nyāsa; the Śaradātilaka (IV. 29–41, V. 5–7), Mahānirvāṇatantra (III. 41–43, V. 113-118) describe several varieties of nyāsa. Rāghavabhaṭṭa on Śāradātilaka (IV. 29–41) cites numerous quotations on *nyāsa* from an extensive literature. There are several kinds of nyāsa such[1828] as Haṁsanyāsa, Praṇavanyāsa, Mātṛkānyāsa, Mantranyāsa, Karaṇyāsa, Aṅganyāsa, Pīṭhanyāsa. Praṇavanyāsa is illustrated as 'om ām Brahmaṇe namaḥ', 'om ām Viṣṇave namaḥ' and so on for all the names set out by Rāghavabhaṭṭa on Śāradātilaka 25. 58. The Aṅganyāsa (nyāsa on parts of the body) is illustrated as follows: om hṛdayāya namaḥ, om śirase svāhā, śikhāyai vaṣaṭ, om kavacāya hum, om netratrayāya (or netradvayāya) vaṣaṭ, om astrāya phaṭ'. Several Purāṇas contain provisions about *nyāsa*. The Garuḍapurāṇa (I. chapters 26, 31, 32) describes aṅganyāsa as part of worship, japa and homa. The Nāradīyapurāṇa (II. 57. 13–14), the Bhāgavata (VI. 8, about 40 verses), Brahma (60. 35–40) provide for nyāsa of the mantras 'om namo Nārāyaṇāya', and 'om Viṣṇave namaḥ'. The Kālikāpurāṇa (chap. 77) deals with Mātṛkānyāsa. The Smṛtimuktāphala (Āhnika pp. 329–331) quotes several passages dealing with nyāsa of the 24 letters of the Gāyatrī (Ṛg. III. 62. 10) on several parts of the body, meditation on each of the 24 letters as having certain colours of flowers and as identical with certain gods and avatāras and nyāsa of the Gāyatrīpādas on limbs. The Brahmapurāṇa

---

1828. राघवभट्ट illustrates हंसन्यास as 'हं पुरुषात्मने नमः, सः प्रकृत्यात्मने नमः, हंसः प्रकृतिपुरुषात्मने नमः' on शारदा० IV. 29; आत्मनो देवताभावप्रदानादेवतेति च। एवं समस्ततन्त्रेषु विद्वद्भिः समुदीरितम्॥ हृदयशिरसोः शिखायां कवचास्त्रयोश्च सह चतुर्थीषु। नत्या हुत्या च वषड् हुं वौषट् फट्पदैः षडङ्गविधिः॥ प्रपञ्चसार VI. 5–6. Compare शारदा० *IV. 33–35 and* महानिर्वाण *III. 142 for similar provisions.*

(60. 35-39) deals with the nyāsa of the mantra 'om namo Nārāyaṇāya' on the fingers and also on other parts of the body, and speaks of Karanyāsa and Aṅganyāsa in 28. 26. Padma[1829] (VI. 79. 17-30) describes the nyāsa of the names of Viṣṇu on the limbs of the body from the head to the feet and Padma VI. 85. 26 speaks of Aṅganyāsa and Karanyāsa with the mantra 'om namo bhagavate Vāsudevāya'. The Matsyapurāṇa[1830] provides for the employment in nyāsa of mantras with 'om' prefixed to them. Karāṅganyāsa and Aṅganyāsa of Gāyatrī are dealt with in Devībhāgavata XI. 16. 76-91 and it expressly names nyāsa as part of *sandhyā* worship.[1831] Vide also Devībhāgavata XI. 7. 26-38 for nyāsa and Kālikāpurāṇa 53. 36. The Devībhāgavata (VII. 40. 6-8) mentions the nyāsa of certain letters on such parts of the body as the chest, the space between the eyebrows, the head. The Bṛhad-yogīyājñavalkya[1832] contained

---

1829. The passage of पद्म VI. 79. 17-30 begins and ends as follows: शिखायां श्रीधरं न्यस्य शिखाधः श्रीकरं तथा। हृषीकेशं तु केशेषु मूर्ध्नि नारायणं परम्॥ एवं न्यासविधिं कृत्वा साक्षान्नारायणो भवेत्। यावन्न व्याहरेत्किंचित् तावद्विष्णुमयः स्थितः॥.

1830. ओङ्कारपूर्वका ह्येते न्यासे बलिनिवेदने। मन्त्राः स्युः सर्वकार्याणां बुद्धिपुष्कलप्रदाः॥ मत्स्य 266. 29.

1831. अथ न्यासविधिं वक्ष्ये सन्ध्याया अङ्गसम्भवम्। XI. 16. 76. The संस्काररत्नमाला, a comparatively modern work, remarks (p. 229) that Nyāsa has no Vedic authority and hence some do not perform it 'एषोङ्गन्यासः। एतमेके नेच्छन्ति स ह विधिरवैदिक इति।'. The षडङ्गन्यास of गायत्री takes the form 'तत्सवितुर्हृदयाय नमः, वरेण्यं शिरसे स्वाहा, भर्गो देवस्य शिखायै वषट्, धीमहि कवचाय हुं, धियो यो नो नेत्रत्रयाय वौषट्, प्रचोदयात् अस्त्राय फट्। इति षडङ्गन्यासः कार्यः। न वा कार्यो न्यासविधेरवैदिकत्वादिति गृह्यपरिशिष्टे स्पष्टम्। तेनाक्षरन्यासपादन्यासादीनां मुद्रादिविधेः शापमोचनादिविधेश्च तान्त्रिकत्वेनावैदिकत्वादनावश्यकत्वं वेदितव्यम्। धर्मसिन्धु III. p. 272. The passage quoted by Aparārka is interesting and a few verses are cited here 'अप्स्वग्नौ हृदये सूर्ये स्थण्डिले प्रतिमासु च। षट्स्वेतेषु हरेः सम्यगर्चनं मुनिभिः स्मृतम्। अग्नौ क्रियावतां देवो दिवि देवो मनीषिणाम्। प्रतिमास्वल्पबुद्धीनां योगिनां हृदये हरिः॥ आनुष्टभस्य सूक्तस्य त्रिष्टुबन्तस्य देवता। पुरुषो यो जगद्बीजमृषिर्नारायणः स्मृतः॥ प्रथमां विन्यसेद्वामे द्वितीयां दक्षिणे करे। तृतीयां वामपादे तु चतुर्थीं दक्षिणे न्यसेत्। ... अष्टमे पञ्चदशीं चैव षोडशीं मूर्ध्नि विन्यसेत्। अपरार्क pp. 140-141. आनुष्टभस्य सूक्तस्य refer to the पुरुषसूक्त (ऋ. X. 90), the first fifteen verses of which are in Anuṣṭubh metre and the 16th (last verse) is in त्रिष्टुभ् metre. The verses from अप्स्वग्नौ to नारायणः स्मृतः are नरसिंहपुराण 62. 5-8 (with slight variations).

1832. अङ्गुष्ठे चैव गोविन्दं तर्जन्यां तु महीधरम्। मध्यमायां हृषीकेशमनामिकायां त्रिविक्रमम्। कनिष्ठिकायां न्यसेद्विष्णुं हस्तमध्ये च माधवम्। स्मृतिच. I. p. 198 quoting योगियाज्ञवल्क्य. These verses are quoted by स्मृतिमुक्ताफल (आह्निक p. 331) from the स्मृतिचन्द्रिका. The ed. of बृहद्योगियाज्ञ. (chap. V) published by the कैवल्यधाम of Lonavala deals with nyāsa but does not contain the above verses.

verses dealing with the nyāsa of the names of Viṣṇu such as Govinda, Mahīdhara, Hṛṣīkeśa, Trivikrama, Viṣṇu, Mādhava on the fingers of the right hand and the palm and back respectively, which are quoted by the Smṛticandrikā (I. p. 198) as from Yoga-yājñavalkya and which have been taken over in the *sandhyā* worship in modern times. The latter work (Sm. C. I. p. 145) also contains Aṅganyāsa of several portions of Gāyatrī, the nyāsa of the single letters of the Gāyatrī on the limbs and Aparārka (p. 140) quotes a passage for the employment of the sixteen verses of the Puruṣasūkta (Ṛg. X. 90) for nyāsa on the several limbs in the worship of Viṣṇu. For the nyāsa of the letters of the alphabet from 'a' to 'kṣa', vide Śāradātilaka V. 5-8 and Rāghavabhaṭṭa on V. 4 who quotes verses setting out how each letter is to be meditated upon. The Mahānirvāṇa (V. 176-178) also specifies the limbs on which there is to be nyāsa of the letters of the alphabet from the forehead downwards.

The above passages show that the item of nyāsa was taken over from Tāntrika works in the Purāṇas for the rites of the orthodox people several centuries before Yogayājñavalkya, Aparārka (first half of 12th century A. D.) and the Smṛticandrikā. The Varṣakriyākaumudī[1833] (about first half of 16th century) shows that long before it the Garuḍa and the Kālikā purāṇas contained provisions on nyāsa. The Devapratiṣṭhātattva of Raghunandana (p. 505) speaks of Mātṛkānyāsa and Tattvanyāsa. The Pūjāprakāśa section of the Vīramitrodaya dwells upon Mātṛkānyāsa, Aṅganyāsa, Gāyatrīnyāsa on pp. 130, 131, 132 respectively. The Bhaktiprakāśa (pp. 88-89) of the same work deals with Mātṛkānyāsa. In modern times some orthodox people still perform two kinds of nyāsas as follows; The Antarmātṛkā which consists in the mystic assignment (mentally) of the letters of the alphabet (from 'a' to 'kṣa') on the fingers of the hands and on the palm and back of the hands and on several parts of the body viz. the throat, organs of generation, the ādhāra place and the middle of the eyebrow (as the seats of the six psychic cakras mentioned in note 1715 above). The Bahirmātṛkānyāsa consists in assigning the individual alphabet letters with *anusvāra* on each on the limbs from head to feet in such forms as 'āṃ namaḥ mūrdhni' and so on.

1833. गरुडकालिकापुराणादिषु प्रथमाङ्गानां केवलानामङ्गन्यासादीनां न्यासदर्शनाच्च । व. क्रि. कौ. p. 124.

The word nyāsa is derived from the root 'as' 'to cast' with 'ni' and literally means 'placing or depositing in or on'. The Kulārṇava explains it as follows:[1834] 'nyāsa is so called because therein riches that are acquired in a righteous way are deposited or placed with persons whereby all-round protection is got' (so by the ritual touching of the chest and other limbs with the tips of the fingers and the palm of the right hand accompanied by mantras the worshipper can act fearlessly in the midst of bad men and becomes like a god). Vide Jayākhyasaṁhitā quoted below.[1835]

The subject of nyāsa was briefly dealt with in H. of Dh. Vol. II. p. 319–320. In 'Principles of Tantra' Sir John Woodroffe (pp. LXXI–LXXVII) compares the ritual of nyāsa with the Christian method of making the sign of the cross.

Mudrā is another characteristic item in Tāntrik ritual. The word *mudrā* has several meanings, four of which have a bearing on Tāntrik practices. It means a posture in yogic practices in which the whole body plays a part. It also means the symbolic or mystic intertwining of the fingers and hands as part of religious worship. Mudrā is also the 4th of the five *makāras* and means various kinds of grains mixed with ghee or other ingredient (vide note 1752 above) or parched grains. A fourth meaning of mudrā is the woman with whom a Tāntrika yogi associates himself (as in Prajñopāya o V. 24 and Sekoddeśaṭīkā p. 56). The Kulārṇava derives the word from 'mud' meaning 'delight' or 'pleassure' and 'drāvay' (causal of 'dru') and says 'mudrās' (ritual finger and hand poses) should be shown (in worship) and are so known because they give delight to the gods and make their minds melt (with compassion for the worshipper). But the Śāradātilaka[1836] appears to derive it from 'mud' and 'rā' (to

---

1834. न्यायोपार्जितवित्तानामङ्गेषु विनिवेशनात्। सर्वरक्षाकराद् देवि न्यास इत्यभिधीयते॥ कुलार्णव 17. 56.

1835. संवृतनियतो मन्त्री मन्त्रन्यासं समाचरेत्। येन विन्यस्तमात्रेण देवदेवसमो भवेत्। पूजादौ सर्वकार्याणामधिकारश्च जायते। यं कृत्वा निर्भयस्तिष्ठेद्दुष्टेभ्यो दुष्टसमाकुले। विजयश्चापमृत्यूनां न्यासेन विहितेन च॥ जयाख्यसंहिता, पटल XI. 1-3.

1836. मुदं कुर्वन्ति देवानां मनांसि द्रावयन्ति च। तस्मान्मुद्रा इति ख्याता दर्शितव्याः कुलेश्वरि॥ कुलार्णव 17. 57; मुदं कुर्वन्ति देवानां राक्षसान्द्रावयन्ति च॥ विष्णुसंहिता VII. 43; आवाहन्यादिका मुद्राः प्रवक्ष्यामि यथाक्रमम्। याभिर्विरचिताभिस्तु मोदन्ते सर्वदेवताः॥ शारदा० 23. 106, on which राघवभट्ट comments 'रा दाने। मुदं राति ददातीति मुद्रेति निर्वचनम्।... अत एव तद्दर्शनेन देवताहर्षोत्पत्तिः। स्याङ्गुल्यो हि पञ्चभूतात्मिका अङ्गुल्या

(Continued on next page)

give) and according to it *mudrā* means 'what affords pleasure to the Gods'. Other derivations are also proposed (vide J. O. R. Baroda, vol. VI, p. 13). Rāghavabhaṭṭa states that the fingers from the thumb to the small finger are identified with the five elements viz. ākāśa (sky or ether), wind, fire, water and earth and that their contact with each other tends to make the deity favourable and delighted and induces the deity to be present at the worship, and that various appropriate mudrās are to be employed in worship, at the time of japa, in meditation and in all rites performed for securing some desired object or benefit, since they induce the deity to be present (near the worshipper[1837]). It was supposed that mudrās helped in enhancing concentration on the part of the worshipper. Even as early as the 7th century it was believed that the making of mudrās may bring to life one who, being poisoned had fallen into coma, as the Kādambarī quoted below shows. The Varṣakriyā-kaumudī quotes a verse saying that japa, prāṇāyāma, worship of gods, yoga, meditation and *āsanas* are fruitless unless accompanied by appropriate mudrās.

The word mudrā occurs in the name of Lopāmudrā,[1838] wife of Agastya, who figures in a hymn of the Ṛg. (I. 179. 4). The word 'mudrā' is not mentioned in the Amarakośa.

(*Continued from last page*)

आकाशवाय्वग्निसलिलभूरूपास्तासां मिथः संयोगरूपसङ्केतात्कोपि देवताप्रमुणीभावपूर्वको मोदः सांनिध्यकरो भवति। तदुक्तम्। पृथिव्यादीनि भूतानि कनिष्ठाद्याः क्रमान्मताः। तेषामन्योन्यसम्भेदप्रकारैस्तत्वपञ्चता।'. योगिनीहृदय I. 57 derives as in कुलार्णव. The verse 'मोदयन्ति महाविभ्वः' quoted in J. O. I. Baroda, vol. VI, p. 13 as from कामकलाविलास occurs in a footnote appended by the editor (in the Kashmir series of texts) and not in the text of the कामकलाविलास. The half verse 'याभिर्वि... देवताः' of शारदा° 23. 106 is the same as मुद्रानिघण्टु (Tāntrik texts vol. I, p. 46).

1837. अर्चने जपकाले तु ध्याने काम्ये च कर्मणि। तत्तन्मुद्राः प्रयोक्तव्या देवतासंनिधापकाः q. in पूजाप्रकाश। p. 123 and by राघवभट्ट on शारदा° 23.336: स्नाने चावाहने चैव प्रतिष्ठायां च रक्षणे। नैवेद्ये च तथान्ये च तत्तत्कर्मप्रकाशने। स्थाने मुद्राः प्रकर्तव्याः स्वस्वलक्षणसंयुताः॥ Tāntrik texts vol. I. p. 46, verses 1–3; मुद्राबन्धाद् ध्यानाद्वा विषप्रसुप्तस्योत्थापने कीदृशी युक्तिः। कादम्बरी, उत्तरभाग (in शुकनास's consoling speech to तारापीड on the reported heart failure of Candrāpīḍa; compare आर्यमञ्जुश्रीमूलकल्प p. 369 'निर्विषोपि भवेत्क्षिप्रं यो जन्तुर्विषमूर्च्छितः। चत्वारिंशति समाख्याता मुद्रा श्रेष्ठा महर्धिका॥; व. क्रि. कौ. p. 156 'मुद्रां विना तु यज्जाप्यं प्राणायामः सुरार्चनम्। योगो ध्यानासने चापि निष्फलानि तु भैरव'॥. This verse is कालिकापुराण 70. 35. मुद्राभिरेव तुष्यन्ति न पुष्पादिकपूजनैः। महापूजा कृता तेन येन मुद्राष्टकं कृतम्॥ मेरुतन्त्र 17. 22.

1838. लोपामुद्रा वृषणं नी रिणाति धीरमधीरा धयति श्वसन्तम्॥ ऋ. I. 179. 4.

The H. of Dh. vol. II. (pp. 320-321) makes a brief mention of mudrās in worship and refers to the work of Miss Tyra de Kleen on the mudrās practised by Bauddha and Śaiva priests called *pedandas* in the island of Bali. Here the same subject will be dealt with in a little more detail and from different points of view.

There is a great divergence among the Tantra, Purāṇa and Yoga works on the number, names and definitions of mudrās. This may be briefly illustrated.

In the Tāntrik texts (Vol. I. pp. 46-47) there is a nighaṇṭu (a glossary or enumeration) of mudrās with names and definitions, where it is stated that nine mudrās (*āvāhanī* and others) are common (i. e. capable of being employed in any worship); and then are enumerated mudrās specially appropriate to Viṣṇu worship (19 in all viz. Śaṅkha, Cakra, Gadā, Padma, Veṇu, Śrīvatsa, Kaustubha, Vanamālā, Jñāna, Vidyā, Garuḍa, Nārasiṁhī, Vārāhī, Hayagrīvī, Dhanus, Bāṇa, Paraśu, Jagan-mohinī, Vāma; ten of Śiva (Liṅga, Yoni, Triśūla, Akṣamālā, Abhīti i. e. abhaya, Mṛga, Asikā, Khaṭvāṅga (a club with a skull at the top), Kapāla, Ḍamaru; one of the Sun (viz. Padma); seven of Gaṇeśa (Danta, Pāśa, Aṅkuśa, Avighna, Paśu, Laḍḍuka, Bījapūra (i. e. a citron).[1839]

The Śāradātilaka (23. 106-114) names only nine mudrās and defines them, while the Viṣṇusaṁhitā (VII) says that mudrās are innumerable (verse 45), names about thirty and defines them and Jñānārṇava (IV), mentions at least nineteen. The Jayākhyasaṁhitā (8th Paṭala) has about 58 mudrās. The Tāntrik[1840] works provide that mudrās should be practised

---

1839. These Mudrās are also mentioned in a work called Mudrālakṣaṇa (D. C. Ms. 291 of 1887-91). Some of these mudrās in connection with the worship of individual gods occur in Viṣṇusaṁhitā VII and in Jñānārṇava IV. The Mudrānighaṇṭu names and defines mudrās of Śakti, Agni, Tripurā and other deities. The mudrās specially appropriate in the worship of Viṣṇu, such as Śaṅkha, Cakra, Gadā, Padma, Kaustubha, Śrīvatsa, Vanamālā, Veṇu are described in a work called Nāradatantra quoted by Varṣakriyākaumudī pp. 154-156.

1840. पटान्ते बन्धयेद् मुद्रां न चापि कथयेद् बुधः। कथनाज्जायते क्षोभस्तस्माद्गोप्या सदा बुधैः। आनन्त्यादखिला मुद्रा वक्तुं ब्रह्मन् न शक्यते। विष्णुसंहिता VII. 44-45 (T.S.S.); न जातु दर्शयेन्मुद्रां महाजनसमागमे। क्षुभ्यन्ते तन्मुनिश्रेष्ठ तस्माद्रहसि योजयेत्। नादीक्षितस्य मुद्राणां लक्षणानि प्रकाशयेत्। क्षुभ्यन्ति देवतास्तस्य मन्त्रं च विफलं भवेत्॥ quoted from महासंहिता by राघवभट्ट on शारदा० 23. 114; स्मृतिच. (I p. 148) quotes the first verse and the last half verse.

secretly under cover of a garment and not in the presence of many people and should not be announced to another as otherwise they become fruitless. The Kāmakalāvilāsa of Puṇyānanda expressly mentions (in verse 46) Trikhaṇḍā-mudrā and refers to the fact that there are nine mudrās.[1841] The Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava (3rd viśrāma) first defines Trikhaṇḍā, then names and defines nine mudrās most of which bear names different from those in the Śāradātilaka. The Mudrās mentioned by Nityāṣoḍaśikā apart from Trikhaṇḍā, are: Sarvasaṅkṣobhakāriṇī, Sarvavidrāviṇī, Ākarṣiṇī, Sarvāveśakarī, Unmādinī, Mahāṅkuśā, Khecarī, Bījamudrā, Yonimudrā.

The Jñānārṇava Tantra (IV. 31–47 and 51–56 and XV. 47–68) names over thirty mudrās, several of which bear the same names as those in Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava, are defined in a similar way and are quoted by Bhāskararāya in his commentary on the latter work. In these circumstances the author proposes to name and describe first of all the nine mudrās of the Śāradātilaka.[1842] (1) Āvāhanī mudrā consists in folding both hands in a hollow and filling the hollow completely with flowers; (2) sthāpanī is the same as āvāhanī but the folded hands are held upside down; (3) the 'sannidhāpana-mudrā' occurs when the two hands are formed into a closed fist, are joined together with only the

---

1841. आधारनवकस्था नवचक्रत्वेन परिणतिं याताः॥ नवनाथात्मकयोऽपि च मुद्राकारेण ताश्चक्रे॥ कामकलाविलास verse 67.

1842. सम्यक् सम्पूरितः पुष्पैः कराभ्यां कल्पितोऽञ्जलिः। आवाहनी समाख्याता मुद्रा देशिकसत्तमैः॥ अधोमुखी कृता सैव प्रोक्ता स्थापनकर्मणि। आश्लिष्टमुष्टियुगला प्रोन्नताङ्गुष्ठयुग्मका॥ सन्निधाने समुद्दिष्टा मुद्रेयं तन्त्रवेदिभिः। अङ्गुष्ठगर्भिणी सैव सन्निरोधे समीरिता॥ उत्तानौ द्वौ कृतौ मुष्टी संमुखीकरणी स्मृता। देवताङ्गे षडङ्गानां न्यासः स्यात्सकलीकृतिः॥ सव्यहस्तकृता मुष्टिर्दीर्घाधोमुखतर्जनी। अवगुण्ठनमुद्रेयमभितो भ्रामिता सती॥ अन्योन्याभिमुखाश्लिष्टकनिष्ठानामिका पुनः। तथा च तर्जनीमध्या धेनुमुद्रा समीरिता॥ अमृतीकरणं कुर्यात्तया देशिकसत्तमः। अन्योन्यग्रथिताङ्गुष्ठा प्रसारितकराङ्गुली॥ महामुद्रेयमुदिता परमीकरणे बुधैः। प्रयोजयेदिमा मुद्रा देवतायागकर्मणि॥ शारदा° 23. 107–114. It may be noted that the ज्ञानार्णवतन्त्र (IV, 32–37) names and describes eight of these nine mudrās almost in the same words, omitting संमुखीकरणी and calling the महामुद्रा of शारदा° by the name परमीकरण. The कुलार्णव (17, 90-93) has eight out of these nine, omitting संमुखीकरणी and employing the words परमीकरण for महामुद्रा. Both कुलार्णव and शारदा° connect अमृतीकरण with धेनुमुद्रा. The कौलावलीनिर्णय VII. 5–14 has eight out of the nine described by शारदा° and appears to be based on the कुलार्णव. The half-verse देवताङ्गे ... कृतिः occurs in कुलार्णव 17. 92 and कुलार्णव 17. 93 says 'समस्तेत्यञ्जलिर्द्वौ वि परमीकरणं विदे ।'. महानिर्वाण° VI. 77 states 'मीलयेद् देवमुद्राभ्यां षडङ्गैः सकलीकृतिः'. The mudrās described in शारदातिलक are quoted by श. क्रि. कौ. p. 153.

thumbs raised up; (4) 'Sannirodhanī' means the same as the preceding but with the thumbs closed inside the fist; (5) the mudrā is called 'Sammukhīkaraṇī' when the two closed fists are held upwards; (6) 'Sakalīkṛti' mudrā is the action of making the nyāsa of the six limbs on the limbs of the (image of) the *devatā* (deity worshipped); (7) the 'Avaguṇṭhana' mudrā consists in closing the fingers held straight and turned downwards and waving the hand round (the image); (8) 'Dhenumudrā' (a complicated pose) is formed by putting the right small finger over the right ring finger, intertwining the former with the left ring finger, the left small finger as it is, to be intertwined with the right ring finger, the left ring finger is to be passed over the left middle finger and the left thumb, and to be intertwined with the right hand middle finger brought to the right side of the left index finger and the right hand index finger to be joined with the left hand middle finger; (9) Mahāmudrā is constituted by intertwining the thumbs of both hands *and holding the other fingers straight.*

Some of the works on Yoga describe various mudrās. For example, the Haṭhayogapradīpikā (III. 6-23) describes at length ten mudrās and the Gheraṇḍasaṁhitā (III. 1-3) speaks of 25 mudrās and describes them in one hundred verses. The Śivasaṁhitā (IV. 15-31) mentions ten mudrās as the best. An important mudrā in Haṭhayoga practices is the Khecarīmudrā described in Devībhāgavata XI. 66. 62-65, Śivasaṁhitā IV. 31-33, Gheraṇḍasaṁhitā III. 25-27, Haṭhayogapradīpikā III. 32-53. This description differs from the definition of Khecarī in Jñānārṇava (15. 61-63) and Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava III. 15-23. The Vajrolīmudrā (in Haṭhayogapradīpikā III. 82-96) cannot be set out here for reasons of decency and it was supposed to prolong the life of a yogin even after indulgence in sexual orgies.

Some of the Purāṇas contain an extensive treatment of mudrās. The Kālikāpurāṇa mentions aṅganyāsa, karanyāsa in chap. 66 and mudrās like Dhenumudrā, Yonimudrā, Mahāmudrā, Khecarīmudrā in 70. 36-56, 78. 3-6; Devībhāgavata (XI. 16. 98-102) speaks of 24 mudrās at the time of Gāyatrī-japa; the Brahmapurāṇa[1843] and Nāradīyapurāṇa set out eight mudrās

1843. पद्मं शङ्खश्च श्रीवत्सो गदा गरुड एव च। चक्रं खड्गश्च शार्ङ्गं च अष्टौ मुद्राः प्रकीर्तिताः॥ ब्रह्म 61. 55, नारदीय II. 57. 55-56. It may be noted that these are mentioned among 19 Viṣṇu mudrās enumerated from Tāntrik texts vol. I.

(*Continued on next page*)

of Viṣṇu worship. Vide Agnipurāṇa, chap. 26, for a brief reference in 7 verses to some mudrās. The Kālikāpurāṇa (70. 32) states that there are 108 mudrās, 55 for general worship and 53 on special occasions, such as collecting materials, drama, acting (naṭana).

Most verses of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa (in the Lalitopākhyāna, chap. 42) are the same as in the Mudrānighaṇṭu pp. 55–57 verses 110–118; but the largest number of mudrās in dancing is contained in the Viṣṇudharmottara (III). In chap. 32 it speaks of numerous rahasya (secret) mudrās in prose called mudrāhastas and in chap. 33 (1–124) it describes over one hundred sāmānyamudrās and the colophon at the end of the chapter calls them 'nṛttaśāstramudrās' (mudrās in the science of dramaturgy).[1844] This opens up a subject which cannot be gone into here, viz. whether the mystic hand poses (mudrās) in worship were derived from the postures (*karaṇas*), *recakas* (gestures) and 32 *aṅgahāras* (movements of limbs) described in the Nāṭyaśāstra[1845] of Bharata (chapters 4, 8 and 9). It may be noted that the Nāṭyaśāstra (in IV. 171 and 173) speaks of 'nṛttahastas'. Pāṇini knew naṭasūtras of Śilālin and Kṛśāśva.[1846] Bharata speaks of four kinds of acting (*abhinaya* 8. 9–10) viz. āṅgika, vācika, āhārya, and sāttvika. In the 9th chapter the movements of the hands and fingers intertwined or joined are set out. Muṣṭi is defined by Bharata in 9. 55. Mudrās would fall under āṅgika abhinaya; *aṅgahāras* depended upon *karaṇas*

(*Continued from last page*)

cited above. All these except श्रीवत्स are named and defined in the पूजाप्रकाश pp. 124–125. The पूजाप्रकाश p. 136 prescribes that in the worship of विष्णु 'āvāhana' should be made with the mantra 'Sahasraśīrṣā' (Ṛg. X. 90. 1) and 14 mudrās shown 'सहस्रशीर्षेतिमन्त्रेणावाहनं कुर्यात् । तत आवाहनादिचतुर्दशमुद्राः प्रदर्शयेत् । ताश्च आवाहनी स्थापनी संमुखीकरणी सन्निरोधिनी प्रसादमुद्रा अवगुण्ठनमुद्रा शङ्खचक्रगदापद्ममुसलखड्गधनुर्बाणमुद्राः ।'.

1844. Vide विष्णुधर्मोत्तर III. 32 which begins अथातो मुद्राहस्तान् व्याख्यास्यामः and ends with a verse एता रहस्यमुद्रास्ते मयोक्ता नृपसत्तम । अतःपरं प्रवक्ष्यामि सामान्यास्ता निबोध मे ॥; इत्युद्देशे तु ते प्रोक्ता मुद्राहस्ता मया नृप । दर्शयेन्मन्त्रयुक्तानां परां सिद्धिमभीप्सताम् ॥ विष्णुधर्मोत्तर III. 33. 121.

1845. करणैरिह संयुक्ता अङ्गहाराः प्रकल्पिताः । एतेषामिह वक्ष्यामि हस्तपादविकल्पनम् ॥ नाट्यशास्त्र IV 33–34; illustrations of the 108 aṅgahāras enumerated in नाट्यशास्त्र IV. 34–55 are given in the GOS edition of the नाट्यशास्त्र (vol. I), copied from the Naṭarāja temple gopuras at Chidambaram in South India.

1846. पाराशर्यशिलालिभ्यां भिक्षुनटसूत्रयोः । कर्मन्दकृशाश्वादिनिः ॥ पा. IV. 3, 110–111.

and the latter consisted of different arrangements of hands and feet. It is likely that the mudrās in the Hindu and Buddhist Tāntrik works are based on the poses that were evolved in ancient Indian dance and drama and that find their earliest extant description in Bharata-nāṭyaśāstra and that are also to be found in later medieval works on dramaturgy such as the Abhinayadarpaṇa.[1847]

The Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa names and defines 108 mudrās (p. 380). On p. 376 it states that the combination of mudrās and mantras would bring success in all actions and neither *tithi*, nor *nakṣatra* nor fasting would be required. In the Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa[1848] there is a fine eulogy of the mudrās made in dancing viz. they are the graces of the rich, the removers of the sorrow of the distressed, the instruction of the ignorant, the increase of the blessedness (or charm) of women; they were created by Vāsudeva for the removal of portents, as the means of prosperity and of the attainment of desired objects.

The Buddhists also had mudrās. One of the early works of the Mahāyāna school viz. Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa is full of mudrās in the 35th paṭala (pp. 355–381) and states (on p. 380) that there are 108 mudrās.[1849] L. H. Waddell in 'the Buddhism of Tibet or Lamaism' (London, 1895) describes nine mudrās practised in Tibet by the Lamas (pp. 336–337).

In the Indian Antiquary, vol. 26 (1897), pp. 24–25, Burgess mentions nine Buddhist mudrās (slightly differing from Waddell's descriptions) as follows:—(1) Bhūmispṛś or Bhūmisparśa mudrā, an attitude of Śākya Buddha (making the earth as witness); (2) Dharmacakra mudrā (teaching attitude); (3) Abhaya mudrā (of blessing), in which the left hand is open

---

1847. Vide अभिनयदर्पण (edited by Dr. Manomohan Ghosh, 1957) p. 47 where certain postures of the hands are called Śaṅkha, Cakra, Sampuṭa, Pāśa, Kūrma, Matsya, Varāha, Garuḍa, Siṁhamukha, which, as noticed above, are among the mudrās mentioned in the Mudrānighaṇṭu (Tāntrik texts, edited by Avalon, vol. I p. 46 verses 5–7 and pp. 49–50 verses 32 ff, which define Vaiṣṇava mudrās some of which like Garuḍa occur in the Nāṭyaśāstra IX. 201 also.

1848. ईश्वराणां विलासं तु चार्तानां दुःखनाशनम्। मूढानामुपदेशं तत् स्त्रीणां सौभाग्यवर्धनम्। शान्तिकं पौष्टिकं काम्यं वासुदेवेन निर्मितम्। विष्णुधर्मोत्तर III. 34. 30–31.

1849. Vide आर्यमञ्जुश्रीमूलकल्प (35th paṭala) p. 372 for अभयमुद्रा and वरमुद्रा.

on the lap, the right hand is raised in front of the chest with the fingers and thumb half extended and with the palm facing forwards; (4) Jñānamudrā (Dhyāna mudrā?) or Padmāsanamudrā (posture of contemplation); (5) the Vara or Varadamudrā, in which the right hand hangs down over the knee, the palm of the hand turned outwards symbolising charity; (6) Lalitamudrā (enchanting or bewitching); (7) Tarkamudrā (right hand raised to the chest and slightly constricted; (8) Śaraṇamudrā (of refuge or protection); (9) Uttarabodhimudrā (pose of highest perfection, which is apt to be confounded with Dharmacakramudrā).

The Jainas also had mudrās. In J. O. I. (Baroda), vol. VI. No. 1 pp. 1–35 Dr. Priyabala Shah contributes an interesting paper on two Jaina works, one of which called Mudrāvicāra describes 73 mudrās and the other called Mudrāvidhi lists 114 mudrās.

In a recent work 'Royal conquests and cultural migrations' Mr. C. Sivaramamurti (Calcutta, 1955) remarks (on p. 43) that the 'hastas' and '*karaṇas*' on the Gopura at Chidambaram are found also in the Śiva temple at Prambanan in Java, where one can observe many of the *karaṇas* like Patākā, Tripatāka, Ardhacandra, Śikhara, Kartarīmukha, Sūci and hastas like Añjali, Puṣpapuṭa. In another recent work 'Contributions to the History of the Indian Drama' by Dr. Manomohan Ghosh (Calcutta, 1958) it is stated that in the bas-reliefs of Bayon (Angkor Thom) certain aspects of the Cambodian dance and drama, particularly certain gestures depicted and actually observed in practice now in the dances in the royal palace, are similar to those described in the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata such as Añjali, Patākā, Ardhacandra, Muṣṭi, Candrakalā and Kapota (p. 63).

Some Sanskrit medieval Dharmaśāstra works from the 13th century A. D. dilate at some length on mudrās. Hemādri on Vrata (vol. I. pp. 246–247) speaks of mudrās called Mukula, Paṅkaja, Niṣṭhura and Vyoma. The Smṛticandrikā (1st half of 13th century A.D.) names and defines 24 mudrās (I. pp. 146–147). The names are the same as in Devībhāgavata XI. 16. 98–102. The Pūjāprakāśa (part of Vīramitrodaya) defines in all 32 mudrās of which eight, viz. Āvāhanī, Sthāpanī, Sannidhāpanī, Saṁrodhinī, Prasāda, Avaguṇṭhana, Sammukha, Prārthanā are common to the worship of all gods, some are specially appropriate

in Viṣṇu worship, some in worship of the Sun, Lakṣmī and Durgā and the Añjali and Saṁhāra mudrās (the last two) used in the worship of all gods. The Āhnikaprakāśa (part of Vīramitrodaya) names 24 mudrās to be shown at the time of the japa of Gāyatrī (pp. 298–299) which are the same as in Devībhāgavata XI. 16. 98–102, but it quotes them as from Brahmā.[1850] It is difficult to say what work is meant by Brahmā. Mudrās *were not universally practised. It is clear from the Dharmasindhu* and Saṁskāra-ratnamālā quoted in note 1831 that Nyāsa and Mudrā were held to be non-vedic in Mahārāṣṭra at least.

Another item in the Tāntrik worship is that of Maṇḍala which has been also a prominent feature of orthodox Hindu practices in medieval and modern times. But it cannot be said that the concept of maṇḍalas was borrowed by Sanskrit writers from the Tāntrikas. The word was used in the sense of orb or circle. In the Tai. S. V. 3. 9. 2 reference is made to circular bricks (maṇḍaleṣṭakā); vide also Śat. Br. IV. I. 1. 25. The orb of the Sun is also called the wheel (cakra) in Ṛg. IV. 28. 2 and V. 29. 10. The Bṛ. Up. says 'this Āditya is what is (called) truth[1851] (satya)' and refers to the Person in the orb (maṇḍala) of the sun. Then it came to mean any figure or diagram (generally

---

1850. वरदाभयमुद्रे च वरदाभयवत् प्रिये। ज्ञानार्णवतन्त्र IV. 39; the Vara and Abhaya mudrās are defined in Jayākhyasaṁhitā VIII. 104–5 as follows: सुस्पष्टं दक्षिणं हस्तं स्वात्मनस्तु पराङ्मुखम्। पराङ्मुखं लम्बमानं वामपाणिं प्रकल्पयेत्। क्रमाद्वराभयाख्यं तु इदं मुद्राद्वयं द्विज।, विज्ञेयं लोकपालानामिन्द्रादीनां समासतः।. See 'Buddha and the Gospel of Buddha' by A. Coomaraswamy (London 1916) p. 262 for a Bhumisparśa-mudrā from Ceylon (of 18th century A. D.) and 'Buddhist Art in India' by Prof. Grünwedel tr. by Agnes C. Gibson, figure 126 p. 178 for Bhumisparśamudrā (of Buddha) and pp. 38 and 330 (of Coomaraswamy's work) for Dharmacakramudrā respectively of Gupta period and from Gandhāra (1st or 2nd century A. D.) and Dr. B. Bhattacharya's 'Buddhist Iconography' plate XXVIII for the same. Vide 'Serpent Power' by A. Avalon (5th edition, 1953 pp. 480 and 488) for illustrations of Yogimudrā in Siddhāsana and Mahāmudrā respectively as practised by modern practitioners of yoga. In the Memoirs of Arch. S. I. No. 66 plate XIII (g) has Abhayamudrā of standing Buddha and 'Buddhist Art in India' (above) p. 192 has Abhayamudrā of Maitreya from a relief in Swat, while in V. A. Smith's 'History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon' (ed. of 1930) plate 113 shows Buddha seated in Abhayamudrā from Java. Vide N. K. Bhattasali's 'Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical sculptures in the Dacca Museum' (1929) plate VIII opposite p. 30 for a fine Bhūmisparśa mudrā of Buddha and pp. 56 and 57 plates XX and XXI for Varada mudrās (right hand).

1851. तद्यत्तत्सत्यमसौ स आदित्यो य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले पुरुषो यश्चायं दक्षिणेऽक्षन् पुरुषः। बृह. उप. V. 5. 2; vide बृह. उप. II. 3. 3.

circular) drawn on an altar and the like. In the Śulbasūtras of Āpastamba and Kātyāyana reference is made to the squaring of a circle (maṇḍala).[1852] The Matsyapurāṇa refers in several passages to maṇḍalas drawn with powders of five colours (as in 58. 22). It also refers to the figure of a lotus of twelve or eight petals drawn with saffron or red sandalwood paste or with various colours (72. 30; 62. 15; 64. 12–13; 74. 6-9 a lotus figure with eight petals and pericarp for sun worship). Varāhamihira in Bṛ. S. (chap. 47) describes[1853] a very auspicious ceremony called Puṣyasnāna in which a maṇḍala was to be drawn on holy ground with powders of different colours in which positions were to be assigned to gods, planets, stars etc. The Brahmapurāṇa (28. 28) mentions the invocation of the Sun on the figure of a lotus and Brahmapurāṇa (61. 1–3) about the worship of Nārāyaṇa on a maṇḍala in the form of a lotus is quoted by Raghunadana in Puruṣottama-tattva (p. 569). The Harṣacarita[1854] (first half of 7th century A. D.) refers to a large maṇḍala being drawn in several colours. The Varāhapurāṇa refers to the images or paintings of Lakṣmī and Nārāyaṇa in a maṇḍala for worship (chap. 99. 9–11). The Agnipurāṇa (chapter 320) refers to eight maṇḍalas, Sarvatobhadra and others. Several maṇḍalas are described in Śāradātilaka III. 113–118, 131–134, 135–139 (navanābhamaṇḍala), in Jñānārṇava 26. 15–17 and other works. According to the Amarakośa[1855] Sarvatobhadra is a variety of

---

1852. चतुरश्रं मण्डलं चिकीर्षन् मध्यात् कोट्यां निपातयेत्। पार्श्वतः परिकृष्यातिशयतृतीयेन सह मण्डलं परिलिखेत्। सा नित्या मण्डलम्। यावद्धीयते तावदागन्तु।; मण्डलं चतुरश्रं चिकीर्षन् विष्कम्भं पञ्चदशभागान् कृत्वा द्वावुद्धरेत्। त्रयोदशावशिष्यन्ते सा नित्या चतुरश्रम्। आपस्तम्बशुल्बसूत्र III. 2–3 (Z. D. M. G. vol. LV. p. 579); compare a similar provision in the Śulbasūtra of Kātyāyana q. by राघवभट्ट on शारदातिलक III. 57. Vide 'The science of the Śulba' (a study in early Hindu Geometry) by Bibhutibhushan Datta (Calcutta, 1932) pp. 140 ff. The three fire-mounds required in vedic sacrifices are Gārhapatya, Āhavanīya and Dakṣiṇāgni and they have to be respectively circular, square and semi-circular in form and a further requirement is that all the three have to be equal in area. Therefore, the Āp. Śulbasūtra provides a method for securing this when it says that a person desiring to make a circle (equal in area) to a square etc.

1853. तस्मिन् मण्डलमालिख्य कल्पयेत्तत्र मेदिनीम्। नानारत्नाकरवतीं स्थानानि विविधानि च।... वर्णकैर्विविधैः कृत्वा हृद्यैर्गन्धगुणान्वितैः। यथास्वं पूजयेद्विद्वान्गन्धमाल्यानुलेपनैः। बृहत्संहिता 47. 24 ff. तस्मिन् refers to भूप्रदेशे.

1854. महामण्डलमिवानेकवर्णरागमालिखन्तं ... शिवबलिमिव दिक्षु विक्षिपन्तं (भैरवाचार्यं ...) ददर्श। हर्षचरित III.

1855. सौधोऽस्त्री राजसदनमुपकार्योपकारिका। स्वस्तिकः सर्वतोभद्रो नन्द्यावर्तादयोऽपि च॥ अमरकोश II. (पुरवर्ग).

residence for kings or rich people. The Śāradātilaka (III. 106-130) deals at length with the construction of a Sarvatobhadra-maṇḍala and remarks that it is common to all worship[1856] and provides (III. 122-124) that the maṇḍala should be drawn with five coloured powders viz. yellow with turmeric powder, white produced from husked grains of rice, red with Kusumbha powder, black with the fine powder of half burnt inferior cereals sprinkled with milk and greenish with powder of the leaves of bilva. The Prapañcasāra (V. 64-65) and Agni (30. 19-20) provide for similar coloured powders. The Vāstuyāgatattva of Raghunandana (p. 416) quotes the Śāradātilaka (III. 123-124) about the five powders. The Jñānārṇavatantra (24. 8-10 and 26. 15-17) appears to hold that maṇḍala and *cakra* are synonyms and states that a maṇḍala with nine angles may be drawn on an altar in a pavilion (maṇḍapa) with saffron or vermilion powder.[1857] The Mahānirvāṇatantra also refers to maṇḍalas drawn with coloured powders (X. 137-138). Four characteristics of maṇḍala ceremonies are maṇḍala, mantra, pūjā and mudrā.

The Buddhist tantras also make much of maṇḍalas. In the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa maṇḍalas are described with special directions for painting them. The Guhyasamājatantra speaks of a maṇḍala of 16 cubits with a *cakra* inside. Vide Prof. G. Tucci's 'Indo-Tibetica' vol. IV part I (Rome, 1941) which gives tables containing maṇḍalas and A. Getty's 'The Gods of Northern Buddhism' (1908) Plate XVI for a maṇḍala of nine elements, and 'Contributions to the study of maṇḍala and mudrā' by Erik Haarh pp. 57-91 of vol. XXIII. Nos. 1 and 2 (1958) of Acta Orientalia of the Oriental Societies of Denmark, Norway &c. in which at the end there are photographs of about 100 hand poses (mudrās). The Niṣpannayogāvali (G. O. S.) of Abhayākaragupta, a contemporary of Rāmapāla, king of Bengal (1084-1130 A. D.), describes 26 maṇḍalas in 26 chapters, each maṇḍala having a central deity and other minor Buddhist divinities, sometimes more than one hundred in number.[1858]

1856. मण्डलं सर्वतोभद्रमेतत्साधारणं स्मृतम्। शारदा० III. 131.

1857. मण्डपं (पे?) वेदिकां कृत्वा पुष्पवैतानमण्डितम्। ...वेदिकायां वरारोहे कुंकुमेनाथ वा प्रिये। सिन्दूररजसा वापि विलिखेच्चक्रमुत्तमम्। ज्ञानार्णव 24. 8-10; नवकोणं विरच्याथ सिन्दूरेण महाप्रभम्। कलशान् नव संस्थाप्य हेमरत्नादिपूरितान्। एकं वा कलशं रम्यं स्थापयेद्देशिकोत्तमः। वक्षतो मण्डलं कृत्वा कुङ्कुमाद्यैर्विचित्रितम्। ibid. 26. 15-16.

1858, Vide Dr. B. Bhattacharya's article in J. G. J. R. I. Vol. VI. pp. 273-281 for the importance of Niṣpannayogāvali of Abhayākaragupta for Buddhist deities and psychic literature.

In the collection of the rites and worship called 'Ṛgveda-brahmakarmasamuccaya' published by the Nirṇayasāgara Press (6th ed. Bombay 1936) there are at the beginning several maṇḍalas, plain or drawn in various colours, such as the Sarvatobhadra, Caturliṅgatobhadra, Prāsādavāstumaṇḍala, Gṛhavāstumaṇḍala, Grahadevatāmaṇḍala, Hariharamaṇḍala, Ekaliṅgatobhadra. The Smṛtikaustubha mentions Dvādaśaliṅgatobhadra, Harihara-maṇḍala inside which there is Sarvatobhadra pp. 410–411 (of Nirn. ed. of 1909). They are all passed over here. Sarvatobhadra literally means 'auspicious on all sides'. This concept of an auspicious figure or diagram was carried over in the realm of Poetics. Daṇḍin in his Kāvyādarśa cites a verse in the form called Sarvatobhadra, which is an illustration of what are called 'citra-bandhas'.[1859] About a century before Daṇḍin, the Kirātārjunīya (15.25) gives an illustration of 'sarvatobhadra'.

In the Acta Orientalia volume referred to above there is an interesting analysis of the contents of two Tibetan mss., one containing what is called 'Rice-maṇḍala' in which 37 elements

---

1859. आहुरर्धभ्रमं नाम श्लोकार्धभ्रमणं यदि । तदिष्टं सर्वतोभद्रं भ्रमणं यदि सर्वतः ॥ काव्यादर्श III. 80. किरातार्जुनीय (sarga 15 v. 25) furnishes the following as सर्वतोभद्रः देवाकानिनि कावादे वाहिकास्वस्वकाहि वा । काकारेभभरे काका निस्वभव्यव्यभस्वनि ॥ An example of a verse in the सर्वतोभद्रबन्ध is furnished by काव्यादर्श III. 82, which is as follows:

सा	मा	या	मा	मा	या	मा	सा
मा	रा	ना	या	या	ना	रा	मा
या	ना	वा	रा	रा	वा	ना	या
मा	या	रा	मा	मा	रा	या	मा
मा	या	रा	मा	मा	रा	या	मा
या	ना	वा	रा	रा	वा	ना	या
मा	रा	ना	या	या	ना	रा	मा
सा	मा	या	मा	मा	या	मा	सा

are indicated by their names (vide figure 1) and the other containing 123 drawings of mudrās (hand poses).

Another characteristic item in Tāntrik worship is '*yantra*' (geometrical diagram), sometimes called *cakra* also, which one finds to some extent also in the Purāṇas and slightly in modern orthodox practices. A *yantra* is a diagram (or figure) engraved, drawn or painted on metal, stone, paper or other material. It resembles a maṇḍala but differs from it in this that a maṇḍala may be employed in the worship of any *devatā*, while a yantra is specially appropriated to the worship of a particular deity or employed for a particular purpose. The Kulārṇava-tantra[1860] states; 'Yantra is a development (or product) of mantra and a deity apprehended in the form of a mantra; the deity worshipped on the yantra immediately becomes favourable; yantra is so called because it removes all pains (or perturbations) arising from such faults as love and anger; if God is worshipped in yantras, he is pleased'. The same Tantra further says 'if worship is done without a yantra the *devatā* is not pleased'. Here the word 'yantra' is derived from the root 'yantr'. In another place the same tantra states 'Yantra is so declared because it always saves (the worshipper) from Yama (god of death) and goblins and other dangers'. The Rāmapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣad[1861] observes 'the arrangement (or preparation) of a yantra is the body of the deity which confers safety'. The Kaulāvalīnirṇaya observes 'worship (of a deity) without employing a yantra, satiating (the goddess) without offering flesh, drinking wine without being accompanied by a Śakti (the wife or other woman associated with a Śākta worshipper)-all these yield no fruit.' Some works evolved a 'yantra-gāyatrī' also.[1862]

1860. यन्त्रं मन्त्रमयं प्रोक्तं देवता मन्त्ररूपिणी। यन्त्रे सा पूजिता देवी सहसैव प्रसीदति॥ कामक्रोधादिदोषोत्थसर्वदुःखनियन्त्रणात्। यन्त्रमित्याहुरेतस्मिन् देवः प्रीणाति पूजितः॥ कुलार्णव VI. 85–86 (The first half verse is quoted from अगस्त्यसंहिता by त. कि. कौ. p. 147); विना यन्त्रेण पूजा चेद् देवता न प्रसीदति। ibid. X. 109; यमभूतादिसर्वेभ्यो भयेभ्योपि कुलेश्वरि। त्रायते सततं चैव तस्माद्यन्त्रमितीरितम्। ibid XVII. 61. Here य is supposed to stand for यम and others, त्र is derived from the root 'trai' (or 'trā'). विना यन्त्रेण या पूजा विना मांसेन तर्पणम्। विना शक्त्या तु यत्पानं तत्सर्वं निष्फलं भवेत्॥ कौलावलीनिर्णय VIII. 41-42. साभयस्यास्य देवस्य विग्रहो यन्त्रकल्पना॥ विना यन्त्रेण चेत्पूजा देवता न प्रसीदति। रामपूर्वतापनीयोप. I. 13.

1861. It will be noticed that the latter half is the same as the latter half of कुलार्णव X. 109. Vide Heinrich Zimmer's 'Myths and symbols in Indian Art and civilization' pp. 140–148 on 'yantra'; also अहिर्बुध्न्यसंहिता chap. 36 where the construction and worship of Sudarśanacakra is described.

1862. The यन्त्रगायत्री is: यन्त्रराजाय विद्महे वरप्रदाय धीमहि। तन्नो यन्त्रं प्रचोदयात्॥ मेरुतन्त्र 33. 13.

These passages make it clear that a yantra was deemed to be a factor helping in restraining the restless movements of the mind due to anger, love and the like and in making the mind concentrate on a diagram or model deemed to represent the deity worshipped. It induced concentration and encouraged the mental realization of the deity. The distinction between the *devatā* and yantra is similar to that between the soul and the body. Most Hindus look upon such forms of worship without antipathy because it is felt that they serve as a way of approach to divinity for ordinary unsophisticated people and that it is better to have one's foot on the lowest rung of the ladder to higher life than to have it on no rung at all.

Yantras are described in such Tāntrik and other works as Tripurātāpanī Upaniṣad (II. 3), Prapañcasāratantra (paṭalas 21 and 34), Śāradātilaka (VII. 53-63, XXIV), Kāmakalāvilāsa (verses 22, 26, 29, 30, 33), Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava (I. 31-43) Nityotsava (pp. 6, 64-65), Tantra-rājatantra (II. 44-51, VIII. 30 ff. XXXIII), Ahirbudhnyasaṁhitā (chap. 23-26), Mantramahodadhi (20th Taraṅga), Kaulajñānanirṇaya (X, which speaks of them as cakras), Kaulāvalīnirṇaya (III. 105-135), Merutantra (33rd prakāśa, 562 verses), Mantramahārṇava-tantra (Uttara-khaṇḍa, 11th taraṅga). It is not possible to deal with all this large material here. The Padma (Pātālakhaṇḍa, 79. 1) provides that the worship of Hari (Viṣṇu) may be performed on the Śālagrāma stone or on a jewel or a yantra, a maṇḍala, or images, and not merely in a temple. The Ahirbudhnya-saṁhitā (chap. 36, verses 5-66) describes the procedure of the worship of a Sudarśana-yantra by a king or other personage desiring wealth or prosperity. One yantra or cakra may be explained and illustrated here. The most noted is *Śrīcakra* described in two verses quoted[1863] below and explained in some detail in the

1863. बिन्दु-त्रिकोण-वसुकोणदशारयुग्म-मन्वस्रनागदलसंयुतषोडशारम् । वृत्तत्रयं च धरणीसदनत्रयं च श्रीचक्रराजमुदितं परदेवतायाः॥ q. by शङ्करविजय of आनन्दगिरि (B. I. ed. of 1868) p. 255 and by सेतुबन्ध on नित्याषोडशिका 1. 31 from यामल (*probably from the* रुद्रयामल *said to be composed by the great* शङ्कराचार्य *himself*) and चतुर्भिः श्रीकण्ठैः शिवयुवतिभिः पञ्चभिरपि प्रभिन्नाभिः शम्भोर्नवभिरपि मूलप्रकृतिभिः। त्रयश्चत्वारिंशद्वसुदलकलाश्रत्रिवलयत्रिरेखाभिः सार्धं तव भवनकोणाः परिणताः॥ सौन्दर्यलहरी verse 11 in ed, by Ganesh and Co. Madras, 1957 with Com. लक्ष्मीधरा. Some writers read in the 2nd verse चतुश्चत्वारिंशत्. वसु stands for 8, मनु for 14, नाग for 8, कला for 16. There are two ways of describing it viz. from the bindu onwards (which is called Sṛṣṭi-krama) or from the outer lines to the bindu (which is called saṁhāra-krama). Vide 'Shakti and Shākta' by Sir John

(*Continued on next page*)

Setubandha commentary on Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava (I. 31–46). The latter verses explain how the Cakra is to be drawn with the bindu in a small triangle. The bindu represents Śakti or Mūlaprakṛti solidified. In published works on Tantra the Śrīcakra is represented in colours (as in Saundaryalaharī published by Ganesh & Co. Madras, 1957, facing the title page), while others represent it only by means of plain uncoloured lines (as on the outer cover of the above edition of Saundaryalaharī or on the cover of the Kāmakalāvilāsa ed. by A. Avalon and published by Ganesh and Co. 1953). In some works the figure of Śrīcakra shows no gates as on the cover in 'Principles of Tantra' by A. Avalon or on the cover of Kāmakalāvilāsa, while gates are shown in other works (as in the above edition of Saundaryalaharī before the Sanskrit text). There are nine triangles, five of which have their apex pointing downwards and these represent Śakti and four (representing Śiva) have an apex pointing upwards. The bindu is situated in the smallest triangle pointing downwards. Then there are two pairs of ten triangles (shown in some books as blue and red respectively), then fourteen triangles (coloured blue in some works), then eight-petalled lotus (sometimes coloured red), 16 petalled lotus (coloured blue), then three circles, then three boundary lines with four gates, these two latter being the outer sections of the yantra and the lotuses of 8 and 16 petals being the inner section of the yantra. There are in all 43 angles (some works make 44). The part of the Cakra within the boundary lines is called *bhūpura*. The worship of yantra is *bahiryāga* (outer or external worship of Śakti). The internal worship (*antaryāga*) consists in taking the awakened Kuṇḍalinī through the cakras from Mūlādhāra to Ājñācakra and then uniting it with the Lord Śiva in the Sahasrāra-cakra, the six cakras from Mūlādhāra being identified with

---

(*Continued from last page*)

Woodroffe (*3rd edition of 1929* published by Ganesh & Co, Madras) pp. 399 ff for explanation of the figure of Śrīcakra. A tāntrik work called Devīrahasya (D. C. ms. No. 490 of 1895–98) quotes the verse बिन्दुत्रिकोण...देवतायाः (*on folio 31 a*) *but also cites another verse describing this* चक्र *somewhat* differently.* Cakras are differently enumerated in different works. For example, in D. C. ms. No. 962 of 1884–1887 called चक्रभेद, five cakras employed in the worship of Durgā according to Kaulāgama are राजचक्र, महाचक्र, देवचक्र, वीरचक्र and पशुचक्र (Cat. vol. XVI. on Tantra p. 163), while in another ms. D, C. No 964 of 1887–91, several other cakras are described such as अकडमचक्र, ऋणधनशोधनचक्र, राशिचक्र, नक्षत्रचक्र (Cat. vol. XVI. on Tantra p. 251).

the five elements and mind. This is described in Saundaryalaharī (verse 9). To what lengths 'Śakti' worshippers had gone in the worship of Devī by the *bahiryāga* method would be clear from a passage quoted from the commentary of Lakṣmīdhara, almost the latest among the numerous commentators of the Saundaryalaharī, who was horrified by the methods of Kaulikas.[1864]

The Setubandha on Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava is at great pains to emphasize that the worship of Tripurasundarī is of the nature of upāsanā and not of the nature of *bhakti* and that this upāsanā is of two sorts, one consisting of the recitation of the mantra of the Devī and the other consisting of the worship of the yantra[1865] (or cakra). Verses 126–204 of the Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava detail the different items in the worship of the Śrīcakra. The Nityāṣoḍaśikā and other Tāntrik works say that the great Tripurasundarī is seated in the Śrīcakra.[1866] The great aim of the Śākta *sādhaka* is apparently to realize his identity with the yantra, the mantra, the guru and Tripurādevī. The Varṣakriyākaumudī quotes a verse stating that worship of yantra performed with all mantras is commended and by so doing a worshipper may secure whatever he desires.[1867]

Even a comparatively sober work like the Śāradātilaka provides for the drawing up of yantras for wicked purposes. For example, in VII. 58–59 it describes an Āgneya-yantra to be drawn on a garment secured from a pile in a cemetery and buried near the house of one's enemy for the latter's destruction.

1864. तवाधारे मूले सह समयया लास्यपरया नवात्मानं मन्ये नवरसमहाताण्डवनटम्। उभाभ्यामेताभ्यामुदयविधिमुद्दिश्य दयया सनाथाभ्यां जज्ञे जनकजननीमज्जगदिदम्॥ सौन्दर्य० verse 41 p. 181 (ed. of Ganesh and co. 1951). The com. of लक्ष्मीधर remarks 'अत एव कौलास्त्रिकोणे बिन्दुं नित्यं समर्चयन्ति।... श्रीचक्रस्थितनवयोनिमध्यगतयोनिं भूर्जहेमपट्टवस्त्रपीठादौ लिखितां पूर्वकौलाः पूजयन्ति। तरुण्याः प्रत्यक्षयोनिमुत्तरकौलाः पूजयन्ति। उभयं योनिद्वयं बाह्यमेव नान्तरम्। अतस्तेषामाधारचक्रमेव पूज्यम्। ... अत्र बहु वक्तव्यमस्ति तत्तु अवैदिकमार्गत्वात् स्मरणार्हमपि न भवति।'.

1865. अस्य तन्त्रस्य प्राधान्येन त्रिपुरसुन्दर्युपासनाविधान एव तात्पर्यावगमात्। सा चोपासना मानसक्रियाविशेषरूपा।... तस्मादनुरागव्यावृत्ता क्रियैवोपासना। सा च द्विविधा-तन्मन्त्रजपरूपा तद्यन्त्रपूजारूपा चेति। सेतुबन्ध on नित्या० I. 125 p. 68.

1866. संस्थितात्र महाचक्रे महात्रिपुरसुन्दरी। नित्याषोडशिका० I. 82; ज्ञाता स्वात्मा भवेज्ज्ञानमर्घ्यं ज्ञेयं बहिःस्थितम्। श्रीचक्रपूजनं तेषामेकीकरणमीरितम्॥ तन्त्रराजतन्त्र 35. 6; आसीना बिन्दुमये चक्रे सा त्रिपुरसुन्दरी देवी। कामेश्वराङ्कनिलया कलया चन्द्रस्य कल्पितोत्तंसा॥ verse 37 of कामकला०.

1867. सर्वेषामपि मन्त्राणां पूजा यन्त्रे प्रशस्यते। यन्त्रे मन्त्रं समाराध्य यद्भीष्टं तदाप्नुयात्॥ व. क्रि. कौ. p. 147.

In XXIV. 17–18 and 19–21 two yantras for the destruction of an enemy are described. Vide above p. 1105 for Prapañcasāra (34. 33) providing a yantra for creating passion in a woman and making her run to the person practising magic.

The Tantrarājatantra provides (8th Paṭala, verses 30–32) that yantras that yield all desired objects should be engraved, painted or drawn on pieces of gold, silver or copper or on cloth or birch leaf with paste of sandalwood, agalochum, camphor, musk or saffron and should be worn on the head or the arms or neck, waist or wrist or one should worship them after placing them somewhere (on the ground &c.); vide also Prapañcasāratantra XI. 46 for similar provisions.

At the end of this chapter on Tāntrik doctrines and practices reference must be made to a remarkable circumstance. The Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava (14th century A.D.), that deals with 15 *Darśanas* (points of view or philosophical views), has not a word to say about Tantras, though it devotes considerable space to the atheistic Cārvāka-darśana and the unorthodox Bauddha and Jaina systems. It is impossible to believe that the most learned brothers Sāyaṇa and Mādhava were unaware of the works on Tantra. The silence must be due to some special reason. If one may make a conjecture, it appears that Tāntrik doctrines were discarded for the same reasons that induced the Bengal king Ballālasena in his Dānasāgara to exclude the Devīpurāṇa from the authorities on which he meant to rely. At the time when Sāyaṇa and Mādhava flourished (about middle of 14th century A. D.) Tāntrik doctrines and practices had come into great disrepute. Therefore, Tāntrik doctrines were probably passed over in silence by Sāyaṇa-Mādhava.

APPENDIX TO SECTION VI

Some important published texts consulted by the author on Tāntricism are set out here. Sanskrit works are arranged in the order of the Sanskrit alphabet, but are transliterated in English and their names are printed in italics. Information about authors, dates and editions is set out briefly where available.

Advayavajrasaṅgraha of Advayavajra (11th century A. D.); contains 21 short works on Buddhist philosophy (in G.O.S.), ed. by H. P. Shastri, with a valuable Introduction.

Ārya-Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa (published in TSS in three parts and 721 pages); contains parts of different dates (from 4th to 9th century A.D.). It is Buddhist and included in Tibetan Kangyur. It has now 55 chapters, but a Chinese translation of 10th century has only 28 chapters. Dr. B. Bhattacharya ascribes it to 2nd century A. D.; but Winternitz disagrees (vide IHQ. IX. pp. 1 ff.). Jayaswal in 'Imperial History of India' gives the text of *paṭalavisara* 53 containing 1003 verses, out of which verses 6–344 deal with the biography of Buddha up to his *nirvāṇa* and real history is given from about 78 A. D. to 8th century A. D. in verses 345–980.

Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati of Īśānaśivagurudevamiśra, in four parts, Sāmānyapāda, Mantrapāda, Kriyāpāda and Yogapāda; it contains about 18000 ślokas and is published in T. S. S.; it mentions Gautamīya Tantra, Prapañcasāra and Bhojarāja; composed about 1100 A. D. or a little later.

Kāmakalāvilāsa of Puṇyānandanātha, with the commentary Cidvallī of Naṭanānandanātha (Kashmir S. S.); there are 55 verses with tr. and notes by Arthur Avalon (pub. by Ganesh & Co. Madras, 1953), originally in Tāntrik Texts vol. X.

Kālacakratantra (Buddhist)-Vide J. A. S. B., Letters, vol. XXVIII (1952) pp. 71–76 for an account of this work by Biswanath Bandopadhyaya

Kūlajñānanirṇaya–ed. by Prof. P. C. Bagchi (in Calcutta S. Series, 1934); H. P. Shastri assigned the ms. of it to 9th century A. D., but Prof. Bagchi (p. 3) places it in the

middle of the 11th century A. D. It is ascribed to Matsyendrapāda in the colophons. Vide p. 1115, n 1820 above for Matsyendranātha.

Kālīvilāsatantra—ed. by A. Avalon in Tāntrik Texts, vol. VI (1917) in 35 paṭalas. In X. 20-21 it frankly allows adultery provided the sexual act is not completed. It mentions (in XX. 1) the Kālikāpurāṇa and in XV. 12–13 contains a mantra in a language resembling Assamese and eastern Bengali.

Kulacūḍāmaṇi-tantra (ed. by A. Avalon in Tāntrik Texts, vol. IV, 1915) in seven paṭalas and 430 verses. In I. 4–12 names of 64 tantras are cited.

Kulārṇava-tantra—It is in 17 *ullāsas* and contains over 2000 verses. It is a famous work profusely quoted (published in Tāntrik Texts, vol. V, London, 1917). It is an early tantra, probably composed before 1000 A. D. In the colophons it is said to be a tantra of the Ūrdhvāmnāya (the fifth of the five āmnāyas) and as part of the work of one lakh and a quarter verses. Vide A. B. O. R. I. vol. XIII. pp. 206–211 for a paper on 'Kulārṇava-tantra, its extent and contents' by Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti.

Kaulāvalīnirṇaya of Jñānānandagiri in twenty-one *ullāsas*, ed. by A. Avalon in Tāntrik Texts, vol. XIV; in I. 2–14 names numerous Tantras including yāmalas and in I. 92–93 eight former gurus are named.

Gaṇapatitattva - Old Javanese Text, critically edited, annotated and translated by Dr. (Mrs.) Sudarśadevī Singhal (pub. by International Academy of Sciences, New Delhi, 1958); refers to Mūlādhāra and other Cakras with their positions and colours, six aṅgas of Yoga excluding *yama*, *niyama*, *āsana* and adding *tarka*; gives an account of the production of *nāda* from Niṣkala and of bindu from nāda and so on, of mantras, *bījās* &c.

Guhyasamājatantra or *Tathāgata-guhyaka* (*Buddhist*): It is published in G. O. S.; it is assigned to 4th century A. D. by Dr. B. Bhattacharya (in Intro. to Sādhanamālā, vol. II, p. XCV); vide p. 1050 above for criticism of this view. It probably belongs to the 5th or 6th century A. D. Vide notes 1673 and 1691.

Gorakṣasiddhāntasaṅgraha published in S. B. Texts (1925); mixture of Yoga and Tantra.

Cidgaganacandrikā; ascribed to Kālidāsa; ed. by Trivikramatīrtha in Tāntrik Texts, Vol. XX.

Jayākhyasaṁhitā (published in G. O. S.)—a Pāñcarātra work ascribed to 450 A. D. by Dr. B. Bhattacharya; contains some Tantra topics such as Yakṣiṇī-sādhana, Cakrayantra-sādhana, Stambhana.

Jñānasiddhi of king Indrabhūti, disciple of Anaṅgavajra and father of guru Padmasambhava; pub. in 'Two Vajrayāna Texts' (G. O, S.); assigned to about 717 A. D. (Intro. p. 10); gives in a nutshell leading doctrines of Vajrayāna.

Jñānārṇavatantra, pub. by Anan. Press, Poona; contains 26 paṭalas and about 2300 verses.

Tantrarājatantra, ed. in Tāntrik Texts, vol. VIII and XII and pub. by Ganesh & Co. Madras, 1954, with the commentary Manoramā by Subhagānandanātha; it has 36 chapters. It gives an account of the Kādimata.

Tantrasāra of Kṛṣṇānanda, pub. in Ch. S. S.; about 17th century A. D.

Tantrasāra of Abinavagupta, a summary of Tantrāloka, pub. in Kashmir S. S. (1918). About the first quarter of 11th century A. D.

Tantrābhidhāna with Bījanighaṇṭu and Mudrānighaṇṭu, ed. by A. Avalon in Tāntrik Texts, vol. I. (1913).

Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the com. of Jayaratha, pub. in Kashmir S. S. in several volumes; composed about 1000 A. D.

Tārātantra, ed. by Śrī Girisacandra and pub. in the Gauḍa-granthamālā No. 1 (1913); in 6 paṭalas and 150 verses. It declares that Buddha and Vasiṣṭha were Tāntrik sages of old and nine Kaula gurus whose names end in 'nātha' are mentioned; refers to Mahācīnākhya Tantra and provides for devotee (only male) offering his own blood to Tārā.

Tārābhaktisudhārṇava, of Narasiṁha Ṭhakkura, who was 5th in descent from Govinda Ṭhakkura, author of Pradīpa, com. on Kāvyaprakāśa; composed about 1680 A. D.; ed. by Pancanan Bhattacharya (in Tāntrik Texts vol. XXI, 1940);

a large work in eleven Tarangas and 435 pages on the worship of Tārā, one of ten vidyās connected with Śakti (not the Buddhist divinity Tārā). The 9th Taranga deals with the horrible rite of Śavasādhana (pp. 345-351).

Tārārahasya of Brahmānanda, pub. by Jivananda (1896); mentions Mahācīna, Nīlatantra, Yoginītantra, Rudrayāmala.

Tripurārahasya of Hārītāyana, with com. called Tātparyadīpikā of Śrīnivāsa; pub. in S. B. series; it is a discourse by Hārītāyana to Nārada. Tārākhaṇḍa portion of it is philosophical.

Tripurāsārasamuccaya of Nāgabhaṭṭa with the com. of Govindācārya; pub. by Jivananda (1897).

Dakṣiṇāmūrti-saṁhitā on Śrīvidyopāsanā in 65 paṭalas and about 1700 verses; pub. in S. B. series.

Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava (part of Vāmakeśvaratantra) with the com. Setubandha by Bhāskararāya (1700-1750 A. D.); pub. by Anan. Press (1944).

Nityotsava of Umānandanātha (who bore the name of Jagannātha before *dīkṣā* and who was a Mahārāṣṭra brāhmaṇa patronized by the Tanjore Maratha Chief); this is a supplement to Paraśurāmakalpasūtra; Umānandanātha was a pupil of Bhāsurānandanātha (Bhāskararāya before dīkṣā) and composed the work in Kali era 'rasārṇava-karivedamiteṣu' (Kali 4846 i. e. 1745 A. D.). It is probable that the word arṇava is used for seven instead of for 4 as usual (i. e. 4876, equal to 1775 A. D.); pub. in G. O. S. (1923).

Niṣpannayogāvalī of Abhayākaragupta, a contemporary of king Rāmapāla of Bengal (1084-1130 A. D.). It is Buddhist. The author was a Professor at the Vikramaśilā University in Bihar; describes 26 maṇḍalas, each having a central deity and other minor Buddhist deities that sometimes exceed 100. It is valuable for later Buddhism, its pantheon and ritual; pub. in G. O. S. (1949).

Paraśurāmakalpasūtra, with com. Saubhāgyodayā of Rāmeśvara, pub. in G. O. S. (1923); earlier than 1300 A. D.; claims to be composed by Paraśurāma, son of Jamadagni and chief disciple of Lord Mahādeva.

Pādukāpañcaka, ed. by A. Avalon in Tāntrik Texts, vol. II (1913).

Pārānandasūtra, pub. in G. O. S. (1931); not earlier than 900 A. D., says Dr. B. Bhattacarya.

Prajñopāya-viniścaya-siddhi of Anaṅgavajra, one of the 84 siddhas venerated in Tibet; Buddhist Vajrayāna work pub. in G. O. S. (1929); composed about 705 A. D. acc. to Dr. B. Bhattacharya in Intro. p. XII.

Prapañcasāra (ascribed to Śaṅkarācārya) with com. Vivaraṇa by Padmapāda; pub. in Tāntrik Texts (vol. III) and later a new ed in vol. XVIII–XIX (1939). Vide p. 1105 above. In 36 paṭalas.

Prāṇatoṣiṇī, compiled by Rāmatoṣaṇa Bhattacharya and pub. by Jivananda (Calcutta); it is a very large modern work in 1097 pages.

Brahmasaṁhitā, with the commentary of Jīva Gosvāmi; for Vaiṣṇavas; pub. in Tāntrik texts, vol. XV.

Mantramahodadhi of Mahīdhara with his own commentary; composed in Vikrama year 1645 (1588–89) A. D.; pub. by Jīv. and Venk. Press.

Mahānirvāṇatantra, with the com. of Hariharānanda Bhāratī. It is a leading but late work on Tantra, published very often; ed. by A. Avalon in Tāntrik Texts, vol. XIII in 14 *Ullāsas* as the first part; the ed. of 1929 by Ganesh & Co. has been used in this work; the third ed. of 1953 differs slightly here and there.

Mātṛkā-cakra-viveka of Svatantrānandanātha, with the com. of Śivānanda; pub. in S. B. series, 1934.

Māheśvaratantra, in 51 paṭalas and 3060 verses (pub. in Ch. S. S.); mentions that Tantras are 64 (1. 15 and 26. 11) and names 25 Vaiṣṇava tantras (26. 16–20) and holds that Bauddha tantras are misleading and meant for cruel rites (26. 21–22).

Merutantra; extensive work in 35 chapters, 821 pages and about 16000 verses; pub. by Venk. Press, Bombay, 1908.

Yoginītantra, published by Jivananda; q. by Raghunandana in Ekādaśītattva p. 58.

Yoginīhṛdaya—the last three chapters of Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava (VI–VIII) are so called.

Yoginīhṛdayadīpikā of Amṛtānandanātha, disciple of Puṇyānandanātha, pub. in S. B. series, 1923; about 10th or 11th century A. D.

Rudrayāmalatantra, ed. by Jivananda (2nd ed. in 1892). A very extensive work in 66 chapters and in over 6000 verses

(mostly in Anuṣṭubh metre), supposed to have been declared by Bhairavī to Bhairava (Śiva). It was said to be a huge work in a lakh and a quarter ślokas, e. g. D. C. ms. No. 667 (i) of 1895–1902 called Dhanadāpuraścaraṇavidhi states in the colophon that it is part of the Rudrayāmala (iti Rudrayāmala-sapādalakṣagrantho.... Kiṅkiṇī-tantrokta-Dhanadā-puraścaraṇa-vidhiḥ; BORI cat. of mss., vol. XVI. on Tantra p. 247).

Lalitāsahasranāma with the com. Saubhāgyabhāskara of Bhāskararāya son of Gambhīrarāya, minister of the Bijapur Moslem king; written in *saṁvat* 1785 i. e. 1729 A. D.; Nir. ed. of 1935.

Varivasyārahasya of Bhāskararāya (called Bhāsurānandanātha after dīkṣā) with his own com. called Prakāśa. He flourished between 1700–1750 A. D.; pub. at Adyar, 1934.

Viṣṇu-saṁhitā in 30 paṭalas; pub. in T. S. S. 1925.

Śaktisaṅgamatantra, in four parts, viz. Kālī, Tārā, Sundarī and Chinnamastā; three parts dealing with the first three pub. in G. O. S.; between 1505–1607 A. D. Vide Poona Orientalist, vol. XXI. pp. 47–49 (between 1530–1700 A. D.).

Śaktisūtra—Vide Sarasvatībhavana Studies, vol. X. (pp. 182–187); has 113 sūtras and com. on 19 sūtras; attributed to Agastya by the commentary: the sūtra mentions Jaimini and Vyāsa.

Śāktapramoda (a recent work), compiled by Śrīrājadevanandanasiṁha, chief of Śivahara; pub. by Venk. Press, 1951; contains 17 tantras viz. Kālītantra, tantras called Ṣoḍaśī, Bhuvaneśvarī, Chinnamastā, Tripurabhairavī, Dhūmavatī, Bagalāmukhī, Mātaṅgī, Kamalātmikā, Kumārikā, Balidānakrama, Durgā, Śiva, Gaṇeśa, Sūrya, Viṣṇu.

Śāradātilaka of Lakṣmaṇa-deśikendra (disciple of Utpala); one of the most famous works on tantra. Aufrecht (p. 64) enumerates several commentaries, the most learned and lucid of which is the Padārthādarśa of Rāghavabhaṭṭa, composed in *saṁvat* 1550 (i. e. 1493–94 A. D.). Rāghavabhaṭṭa hailed from Mahārāṣṭra and was a resident of town Janasthāna (Pañcavaṭī) on the banks of the Godāvarī; pub. in Kashi S. S. and in Tāntrik Texts, vol. XVI and XVII. Śāradātilaka was composed about the 11th century

A. D. Raghunandana expressly names Rāghavabhaṭṭa as the commentator of the Śāradatilaka in Jyotistattva p. 580.

Śrīcakrasambhāratantra—A Buddhist work; Tibetan text and English translation by Lama Kazi Dawa Samdup and edited in Tāntrik Texts, vol. VII by A. Avalon, 1919.

Śyāmārahasya of Pūrṇānanda in 16 chapters, ed. by Jivananda; 16th century A. D.

Ṣaṭ-cakra nirūpaṇa, of Pūrṇānanda in 85 verses; pub. in Tāntrik Texts, vol. II; composed śaka 1499 (i. e. 1577–78 A. D.).

Sanatkumāra-tantra – is a dialogue between Sanatkumāra and Pulastya in eleven paṭalas and about 375 verses. Published by Jyestharam Mukundji in Bombay in 1905. It is a mixture of Yoga and tāntrik technique and inculcates the worship of Kṛṣṇa in Tāntrik bījas like 'klīm, gauṁ &c'.

Sādhanamālā, published in two volumes in G. O. S. with a long Intro. to vol. II by Dr. B. Bhattacharya; contains 312 Sādhanas, many of which are anonymous and are known to Tibetan Kangyur; Dr. Bhattacharya states that the Sādhanas range in dates from third century A. D. to 12th century A. D. Winternitz, in I. H. Q. vol. IX (pp. 5–6), does not accept the view that the Prajñāpāramitāsādhana was composed by Asaṅga.

Sāmrājya lakṣmī-pīṭhikā – said to be part of Ākāśa-bhairava Mahātantra, published in Tanjore Sarasvatī Mahal Series in 139 chapters, of which the first 30 are connected with mantra, japa, homa,; chapters 31 ff deal in detail with departments of State, coronation (chap. 43 ff) and festivals like those of New Year, Rāmanavamī, Navarātra, &c.

Sekoddeśaṭīkā – a Buddhist work of Śrīnaḍapāda,; text ed. by Mario E. Carelli in G. O. S. with an Intro. in English.

Saundaryalaharī, ascribed to the great Śaṅkarācārya, has numerous commentaries; ed. by Sir John Woodroffe and pub. at Adyar (1937); ed. of 1957 with three commentaries and English translation published by Ganesh & Co. Madras. There is an excellent edition of this work in 100 verses (text, English translation by Prof. W. Norman Brown, Harvard University Press, 1958).

Śrīvidyāratnasūtra, attributed to Gauḍapāda (in 101 sūtras) with the commentary of Śaṅkarācārya, pupil of Vidyāraṇya,

on 21 sūtras; ed. by Pandit Gopinatha Kaviraja in S. B. Texts series, Benares (1924).

Haṁsavilāsa, of Haṁsamiṭṭhu; pub. in G. O. S. (1937); the author was born in Gujarat in Vikrama year 1794 on Phālguna Full moon day (1738 A. D.). Though not a purely Tāntrik work it quotes many Tāntrik works such as the Kulārṇava (pp. 68–76), Kaularahasya (p. 104), Yoginītantra (p. 103), Śāradātilaka (pp. 84–85, 105 ff). It deals with many other topics such as figures of speech, erotic subjects.

Hevajratantra, edited and translated by Dr. D. L. Snellgrove (Oxford University Press, 1959), in two parts. This work came to the author's hands while this Appendix was passing through the Press. Part I (pub. in 1959) contains Introduction (pp. 1–46), English translation (pp. 47–119), contents (pp. 121–125), diagrams (pp. 126–129), Glossary (pp. 131–141) and Index (pp. 142–190); Part II contains Sanskrit texts and Tibetan texts based on a Nepalese ms. lent by Prof. Tucci; com. called Yogaratnamālā by Paṇḍita Kānha has been included from an old Bengali ms. The editor holds (part I p. 14) that Hevajratantra was in existence towards the end of 8th century A. D. and that Advayavajrasaṅgraha and Sekoddeśaṭīkā borrow from Hevajra-tantra. Sādhanamālā No. 229 (two opening verses) are the same as Hevajra II. 8. 6–7. Hevajra is an invocation of vajra. On p. 11 part I the editor questions how the yogins could call themselves Buddhists when they experienced enlightenment in the embrace of a yoginī. Part I p. 70 mentions Jālandhara, Oḍḍiyāna, Paurṇagiri as pīṭhas and several upapīṭhas, upakṣetras. The term Śakti does not occur in Hevajra but its place is taken by Prajñā. Part II verses 11–15 p. 98 express how the followers of this tantra had sexual experiences with women called mudrās and how thereby they secured *siddhi*. Part I p. 54 contains ritual for gaining mastery over a young woman. Part II p. 2 states 'Hekāreṇa mahākaruṇā vajram Prajñā ca bhaṇyate; Prajñopāyātmakam tantram tan-me nigaditam śruṇu'. This is a very valuable addition to the literature on Tantra and has been very well edited.

Some important works and papers on Tantra—vide also note 1687 for works on Śakti cult.

Catalogue of Palm-leaf and some paper mss. in the Durbar Library of Nepal, by M. M. H. P. Sastri (1905).

Tārānāth's History of Buddhism in India (translated into German by A. Schiefner (St. Petersburg, 1869). Portions were translated into English in I. A. IV. 101 ff. and 361 ff.

'Lamaism' by L. A. Waddell (Allen & Co., London, 1895).

'History of Buddhism in India and Tibet' by Bu-ston translated from Tibetan by Dr. E. Obermiller.

Descriptive catalogue of mss in the Library of Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. VIII (deals with 648 mss. on Tantra in 892 pages).

Bhandarkar's Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism &c. (in collected works, vol. IV. pp. 202–210 on Śāktas).

Tantra of the Great Liberation (translation of the Mahānirvāṇa Tantra) with Introduction and commentary by Arthur Avalon (1913).

Tāntrik Texts edited by A. Avalon, vol. I–XXII, Introductions, notes, analysis &c.

The Serpent Power by A. Avalon (1914), containing translation of Ṣaṭ-cakranirūpaṇa and Pādukāpañcaka (5th ed. of 1953, by Ganesh & Co., Madras).

'Principles of Tantra' parts 1 and 2, ed. by A. Avalon (1914, 1916) with a long Introduction to part 2.

'Wave of Bliss' — translation of Ānanda-laharī (first fortyone verses of Saundarya-laharī) and comments by Sir John Woodroffe (1917).

'Wave of Beauty' - translation of Saundarya-laharī (with text and commentaries) pub. by Ganesh & Co. (Madras, 1957).

'Chakras' by Right Rev. C. W. Leadbeater (Adyar, 1927) with plates.

'Śivasaṁhitā' - translation of - by Shrischandra Vidyarnava.

'Thirty minor Upanishads' translated by K. Narayanswami Aiyar.

'Mysterious Kuṇḍalini' by Dr. V. G. Rele (1927).

'Śakti or Divine Power' by Dr. Sudhendu Kumar Das (Uni. of Calcutta, 1934).

P. C. Bagchi's Introduction to Kaulajñāna-nirṇaya (Calcutta Sanskrit Series, 1934).

'Tibetan Yoga and secret doctrines' by W. Y. Evans-Wentz (Oxford Uni. Press, 1935).

P. C. Bagchi's 'Studies in Tantras' (Cal. Uni. 1939).

Dr. B. Bhattacharya's Introduction to Sādhanamālā vol. II. (G. O. S.) pp. XI-LXXVII; the same scholar's Introduction to Guhyasamājatantra (G. O. S.) and 'Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism' (Oxford University Press, 1932).

'Philosophy of Tripurā Tantra' by M. M. Gopinath Kavirāja in Sarasvati Bhavan Studies (1934), vol. IX. pp. 85–98.

'Some aspects of the philosophy of Śākta Tantra' by M. M. Gopinath Kaviraja in Sarasvati Bhavan Studies, 1938 vol. X. pp. 21–27.

'Buddhist Tantra Literature' by Prof. S. K. De in New Indian Antiquary, vol. I. pp. 1–23.

'Influence of Tantras on the Tattvas of Raghunandana' in I. H. Q. IX. (1933), pp. 678–704 by Prof. R. C. Hazra.

'Influence of Tantra in Smṛtinibandhas' in ABORI vol. 15 pp. 220–235 and vol. XVI. pp. 203–211 by Prof. R. C. Hazra.

'The Tāntric Doctrine of Divine bi-unity' by A. K. Coomaraswamy in A. B. O. R. I. vol. 19. pp. 173–183;

'Comparative and critical study of Mantraśāstra' by Shri Mohanlal Bhagavandas Jhavery (1944);

Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti's following Papers: 'Antiquity of Tāntricism' in I. H. Q., vol. VI pp. 114 ff; 'Controversy regarding the authorship of Tantras' in Prof. K. B. Pathak commemoration volume pp. 210–220; 'A note on the age and authorship of the Tantras' in Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, New Series, vol. XXIX (1933) No. 1 pp. 71–79; 'Ideals of Tantra rites' I. H. Q. vol. X. pp. 468 ff; 'Śākta festivals of Bengal and their antiquity' in I. H. Q. vol. 27 (1951) pp. 255–260; 'Application of Vedic Mantras in Tāntrik rites' in J. A. S. B., Letters, vol. 18 (1952) pp. 113–115; 'Kālī worship in Bengal' Adyar Library Bulletin, vol. XXI, parts 3–4 pp. 296–303;

'Tantras, their philosophy and occult secrets' by D. N. Bose (Calcutta, Oriental Publishing Co.);

'Vajra and the Vajrasattva' by Dr. S. B. Das-Gupta in 'Indian Culture' vol. VIII. pp. 23–32;

'Introduction to Tāntrik Buddhism' by Dr. S. B. Das Gupta (Calcutta, 1950);

'Philosophies of India' by Heinrich Zimmer (1951) pp. 560–602;

'The Veda and the Tantra' by Shri T. V. Kapali Sastry (Madras, 1951) pp. 1–255;

'Yuganaddha' (which literally means 'bound together or yoked together' in the case of opposites) 'the Tāntrik view of Life' by Dr. Herbert V. Guenther in Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Banaras, 'Studies' vol. III. (1952);

The following articles in the Cultural Heritage of India vol. IV, viz. 'Evolution of the Tantras,' by Dr. P. C. Bagchi pp. 211–226; 'Tantra as a way of realization' by Swami Pratyagātmānanda, pp. 227–240; 'The Spirit and Culture of the Tantras' pp. 241–251 by Mr. Atal Behari Ghosh; 'Śakti Cult in South India' by Shri K. R. Venkataraman, pp. 252–259; Tāntrik culture among the Buddhists' by Dr. B. Bhattacharya pp. 260–272; 'The cult of the Buddhist Siddhāchāryas' pp. 273–279 by Prof. P. V. Bapat.

'Lights on the Tantra' by M. P. Pandit (published by Ganesh & Co., Madras, 1957) This is a booklet of 54 pages of text and pp. 55–71 of notes containing hardly anything valuable of the author's own; over three-fourths of it consists of long quotations from the works of Woodroffe (particularly from 'Śhakti and Śhākta'), Sri Aurobindo and Shri Kapali Sastry and is here and there marked by bold and unwarranted assertions such as 'It is the central truths of the Tantra thought and ritual that form the backbone of the Hindu religion today' (p. 36). The present author repudiates totally this assertion. The author of this booklet has to admit that in the case of the Tāntrik cult that abuse of the body of occult knowledge for malevolent purposes instead of for the material and spiritual advancement of man and the vulgarization of the profound rationale of the mystic ritual are deplorable deformations (p. 36), that there has doubtless been a gross misuse of the knowledge developed by this science and that spurious texts have sprung up (p. 21).

'History of Philosophy, Eastern and Western' ed. by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, vol. I. pp. 401–428 on 'Exposition of Śākta belief' by M. M. Gopinath Kaviraj (1953).

'Yoga, immortality and freedom' by Mircea Eliade translated from French by Willard Trask (pub. by Routledge, Kegan, Paul, London, 1958), pp. 200–273 for 'Yoga end Tāntrism'.

'Tibetan Book of the Dead' by Dr. W. Y. Evans-Wentz (3rd ed., Oxford University Press, 1957).

'Tibetan Yoga' by Bernard Bromage (2nd ed. 1959 by Aquarium Press) – deals with magical and religious practices of Tibetans, spells, and exercises which are deemed to produce supernatural powers.

SECTION VII

CHAPTER XXVIII

MĪMĀṀSĀ AND DHARMAŚĀSTRA

The Yājñavalkya-smṛti provides that there are fourteen sources of vidyās (knowledge) and of Dharma,[1868] viz. Purāṇa, Nyāya, Mīmāṁsā, Dharmaśāstra, Aṅgas (six) and the Vedas (four). A similar verse is quoted by some as Manu's, but it is not found in the extant Manusmṛti. It is therefore necessary to consider the origin and meaning of the word Mīmāṁsā, to set out the principal doctrines of that Śāstra, to mention the important rules of interpretation and the maxims of the Mīmāṁsā in their application to topics of Dharmaśāstra and to refer to some of the important works of that Śāstra together with their approximate dates.

The word mīmāṁsā has a great antiquity behind it. The Tai. S. VII. 5. 7. 1[1869] says 'the expounders of Brahma (Veda) discuss (the question) whether a day should be omitted or not'. Here the verbal form 'mīmaṁsante' is employed in the sense of discussing or investigating a doubtful point and arriving at a decision thereon. In another passage of the Tai. S. the same form

---

1868. पुराणन्यायमीमांसा ... च चतुर्दश॥ या. I. 3, quoted in n 1337 above. The बृहद्योगियाज्ञवल्क्य reads 'पुराणतर्कमीमांसा ... चतुर्दश' (12.3). अपरार्क p. 6 quotes from विष्णुपुराण the verse 'अङ्गानि वेदाश्चत्वारो मीमांसा न्यायविस्तरः । पुराणं धर्मशास्त्रं च विद्या एताश्चतुर्दश॥'. It is विष्णुपु. III. 6. 27, वायु 61. 78. This is quoted as Manu's by Prof. T. R. Chintamani in JOR, Madras, vol. XI. supplement p. 1. It occurs in भविष्य (ब्राह्मपर्व 2. 6) also. Vide H. of Dh. vol. I. p. 112 note 198 where औशनसधर्मशास्त्र is quoted for 14 विद्याs and H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 10 note 17 (for the four additional vidyās bringing the total up to 18). Vide a recent publication of Dr. G. S. Ghurye (1957, Bombay) on Vidyās (or Indian contribution to Sociology of knowledge) for detailed treatment. Even before the days of Kālidāsa the Vidyās had been 14 as indicated by Raghuvaṁśa V. 21 (वित्तस्य विद्यापरिसंख्यया मे कोटीश्चतस्रो दश चाहरेति॥).

1869. उत्सृज्यां 3 नोत्सृज्या 3 मिति मीमांसन्ते ब्रह्मवादिनस्तद्वाहुरुत्सृज्यमेवेति ...। तै. सं. VII. 5. 7. 1; व्यावृत्ते देवयजने याजयेद्व्यावृत्कामं यं पात्रे वा तल्पे वा मीमांसेरन् ... नैनं पात्रे न तल्पे मीमांसन्ते। तै. सं. VI. 2. 6. 4–5. The last sentence means 'they do not have any doubt about his being fit for dining with them or fit for relation with him by marriage'.

and another 'mīmāṁseran' are used in the same sense. In several other places the Tai. S. raises points for discussion with the words 'the brahmavādins discuss' but without employing the word mīmāṁsante or a cognate word. Vide Tai. S. II. 5. 3. 7 (about the deity of *sānnāyya*), V. 5. 3. 2, VI. 1. 4. 5., VI. 1. 5. 3-5. The Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā[1870] puts forward a doubtful point for investigation without the words 'Brahmavādins say', but with the word 'mīmāṁsante'. The Atharvaveda[1871] states 'men separately discussing many times noted on the earth her actions'. In another place it employs the words *mīmāṁsita* and *mīmāṁsamāna*. The Śāṅkhāyana[1872] Br. has 'they discuss the question whether one should offer homa after the sun rises or before the sun rises'. The Tai. Br. employs the word mīmāṁsā and the Śatapatha also in the Kāṇva recension does so (vide S. B. E. vol. 26 note 1). In the Chāndogyopaniṣad[1873] it is stated that five scholars very learned in the Veda and possessed of large houses (wealth) named Prācīnaśāla Aupamanyava and others got together and entered upon the consideration of the question 'what is (the nature of) our self and what is Brahma?'. In the Tai. Up. occur the words 'this is the investigation into (the nature of) Bliss (Brahma)'. In both these passages the word mīmāṁsā is used in the sense of 'consideration' (vicāraṇā) of high philosophical topics.'

Pāṇini provides[1874] for the formation of seven roots with *san* affix (Desiderative), one of which is 'mīmāṁsate' from

---

1870. आधेयोऽग्नी३ र्नाधेया३ इति मीमांसन्ते श्वोऽग्निमाधस्यमानेना३ इति । काठकसं. VIII. 12.

1871. पश्यन्त्यस्याश्चरितं पृथिव्यां पृथङ्नरो बहुधा मीमांसमानाः । अथर्व IX. 1. 3; स य एवं विद्वान्न द्विषन्नश्नीयान्न द्विषतोऽन्नमश्नीयान्न मीमांसितस्य न मीमांसमानस्य । अथर्व IX. 6 (2). 24.

1872. उदिते होतव्या३ मनुदित इति मीमांसन्ते । शां. ब्रा. II. 8. Compare मनु II. 15; सैषा मीमांसाऽग्निहोत्र एव सम्पन्ना । तै. ब्रा. III. 10. 9.

1873. प्राचीनशाल औपमन्यवः ... ते हैते महाशाला महाश्रोत्रियाः समेत्य मीमांसां चक्रुः को न आत्मा किं ब्रह्मेति । छा. V. 11. 1; सैषानन्दस्य मीमांसा भवति । तै. उप. II. 8.

1874. गुप्तिज्किद्भ्यः सन् । मान्-बध-दान्-शान्भ्यो दीर्घश्चाभ्यासस्य । पा. III. 1. 5-6; the काशिका explains 'मान पूजायाम् । ... एतेभ्यो धातुभ्यो सन् प्रत्ययो भवति । अभ्यासस्य चेकारस्य दीर्घादेशो भवति । मीमांसते ... मानेर्जिज्ञासायाम् ।'. The bhāṣya of Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. I. 1 winds up the discussion with the words तस्माद् ब्रह्मजिज्ञासोपन्यासमुखेन वेदान्तवाक्यमीमांसा तदविरोधितर्कोपकरणा निःश्रेयसप्रयोजना प्रस्तूयते ।' on which the भामती remarks 'मान् माने-इत्यस्माद्वा मान पूजायाम्-इत्यस्माद्वातोः, मान-बध इत्यादिना निच्छार्थे सति व्युत्पादितस्य मीमांसाशब्दस्य पूजितविचारवचनत्वात् &c.

'mān' and the Kāśikā adds that it means 'desire to know i. e. investigation and final conclusion', having in view probably the sūtras 'Athāto dharma-jijñāsā' and 'Athāto brahma-jijñāsā'.

The foregoing brief discussion shows that long before the Upaniṣads the word 'mīmāṁsā' had come to mean 'investigation into a topic of discussion and coming to a conclusion thereon'. The same word acquired a restricted sense (as in the verse of Yāj. quoted above) viz. investigation into Dharma and arriving at conclusions on doubtful matters by interpretation and reasoning.

Some of the Dharmasūtras disclose familiarity with purely Mīmāṁsā terms and principles. For example, Gaut. states[1875] that an option is allowed only when there is a conflict between two texts of equal authority. The Āpastamba Dharmasūtra is the only Dharmasūtra that contains numerous Mīmāṁsā terms and doctrines. It says 'a positive Vedic text has more force than an usage which merely leads to an inference (of its being based on a Vedic text now lost)'.[1876] This is similar to Jaimini I. 3. 3 'If there is a conflict (between an express Vedic text and a smṛti text) the latter is to be discarded but if there be no conflict an inference may be drawn (that the smṛti text is based on some Śruti)'. Āp. says 'the rules about *anadhyāya* (stopping Veda study on *parvan* &c.) are applicable only to learning the Vedic mantras and not to their application in sacrifices'. In another place Āp. provides 'where activity takes place because of finding pleasure therefrom (i. e. from a worldly motive), there is no (inference of its being based on) śāstra', which is similar to Jaimini's rule. For reasons of space other examples of close agreement between Āp. Dh. S.[1877] and Jaimini are simply referred

---

1875. तुल्यबलयोर्विकल्पः। गौ. I. 5; compare जै. XII. 3. 10 एकार्थास्तु विकल्पेरन् समुच्चये ह्यावृत्तिः स्यात्प्रधानस्य; शबर explains: ये त्वेकार्थाः एककर्तव्यास्ते विकल्पेरन् यथा व्रीहियवौ; vide शबर 'तुल्यार्थयोर्हि तुल्यविषययोर्विकल्पो भवति न नानार्थयोः।' on जै. X. 6. 33; compare मनु II. 14 'श्रुतिद्वैधं तु यत्र स्यात्तत्र धर्मावुभौ स्मृतौ।'.

1876. श्रुतिर्हि बलीयस्यानुमानिकादाचारात्। आप. ध. I. 1. 4. 8; compare 'विरोधे त्वनपेक्षं स्यादसति ह्यनुमानम्' जै. I. 3, 3; विद्यां प्रत्यनध्यायः श्रूयते न कर्मयोगे मन्त्राणाम्। आप. ध. I. 4. 12. 9, compare जै. XII. 3. 19 विद्यां प्रति विधानाद्वा सर्वकालं प्रयोगः स्यात्कर्मार्थत्वात् प्रयोगस्य।'; यत्र तु प्रीत्युपलब्धितः प्रवृत्तिर्न तत्र शास्त्रमस्ति। आप. ध. I. 4. 12 11, compare जै. IV. 1. 2 'यस्मिन् प्रीतिः पुरुषस्य तस्य लिप्सार्थलक्षणाऽविभक्तत्वात्।'.

1877. अङ्गानां तु प्रधानैरव्यपदेश इति न्यायवित्समयः। आप. ध. II. 4. 8. 13, compare जैमिनि I. 3. 11-14 (कल्पसूत्राधिकरण); अथापि नित्यानुवादमविधिमाहुर्न्याय-

(*Continued on next page*)

to in the note below and not explained at length. These examples show that in Āpastamba's day Mīmāṁsā doctrines had been far advanced and since he employs the words 'Nyāyavit-samaya' (the *siddhānta* or doctrine of those who know Nyāya) and 'Nyāyavidaḥ', it follows that he is referring to some work on Mīmāṁsā or some author who composed a mīmāṁsā-sūtra. The correspondence in ideas and words between Āp. and the Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtra is so close that one is tempted to argue that Āp. knew either the extant mīmāṁsāsūtra or at least an earlier version of it containing almost the same expressions. It will not do to say that all the above passages are later interpolations. They have all been commented upon by Haradatta.

Some Śrautasūtras such as that of Kātyāyana contain rules of the interpretation of Vedic texts that are similar to Jaimini's sūtras and sometimes are stated almost in the same words.[1878]

(*Continued from last page*)

विदः &c.। आप. ध. II. 6. 14, 13, compare जै. VI. 7. 30 'अर्थवादो वा विधिशेषत्वात् तस्मान्नित्यानुवादः स्यात्।'; तस्यां क्रयशब्दः स्तुतिमात्रम्। धर्माद्धि सम्बन्धः। आप. ध. II. 6. 13. 11, compare जै. VI. 1. 15 क्रयस्य धर्ममात्रत्वम्।

1878. It may be noted that P. M. S. writers are often called 'Nyāyavidaḥ' by Śaṅkara (on V. S. III. 4. 22), by Viśvarūpa and others. Bhāskara in his commentary on Brahmasūtra (I. 1. 1. p. 5, Chowkhamba series) states: यच्छब्द आह तदस्माकं प्रमाणमिति हि न्यायविदः. These are the words of Śabara in his bhāṣya on P. M. S. III. 2. 36. On Yāj. I. 58 the Bālakrīḍā of Viśvarūpa says "Tathā ca naiyāyikāḥ, '*na hi vacanasyātibhārostītyāhuḥ*'". These are the words of Śabara on Jaimini III. 2.3 viz. 'Kimiva vacanam na kuryāt nāsti vacanasyātibhāraḥ'. So here Śabara is called Naiyāyika. On Yāj. I. 53 the Bālakrīḍā says 'Nyāyavidaśca Yājñikāḥ। api vā sarvadharmaḥ syāt tannyāyatvād vidhānasya'. This last is Jai. I 3. 16 So here Jaimini is called Nyāyavid and Yājñika. Similarly, on Yāj. I. 87 the Bālakrīḍa quotes Jai. VI. 8. 17 as the words of 'Nyāyavido yājñikāḥ'. The J. N. M. V. says *nyāyas* are the *adhikaraṇas*, deciding points of Dharma and expounded by Jaimini 'जैमिनिप्रोक्तानि धर्मनिर्णायकान्यधिकरणानि न्यायाः.' The writers of Śrautasūtras are called merely Yājñikas by Bālakrīḍa on Yāj. I. 38 '*Tathā ca yājñikāḥ vyavahāryā bhavanti ityāhuḥ*'. This quotation is from Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra 22. 4. 27–28. Besides, the sūtra 'Prāyaścittavidhānācca,' is the same in both Kāt. Ś. I. 2. 19 and P. M. S. VI. 3. 7 and Kāt. Ś. I. 8. 6 is the same as P. M. S. XII. 3. 15; moreover, Kāt. Ś. IX. 11. 14–15 employ almost the same words as in P.M.S. III. 5. 36–39, though they hold opposite views. The P. M. S. (IV. 4. 19–21) holds that the Piṇḍapitṛyajña is not an *aṅga* of the rites on darśa (i. e. amāvāsyā), but an independent rite, while the Kāt. Śr. (IV. 1. 28–30) holds that it is an *aṅga*. In the discussion on the meaning of the word Vaiśvā-

(*Continued on next page*)

Only a few examples may be cited here; compare Kāt. I. 1. 9–10 (about rathakāra) with Jai. VI. 1. 44; Kāt. I. 1. 12–14 with Jai. VI. 1. 51 and VI. 8. 20–22; Kāt. I. 1. 18–20 with Jai. XII. 2. 1–4; Kāt. I. 2. 18–20 with Jai. VI. 3. 2–7 (about *nitya-karma* yielding full reward, even though some *aṅga* could not be performed), also Kāt. I. 3. 1–3 with Jai. I. 1. 35–40; Kāt. I. 3. 28–30 with Jai. VI. 6. 3. Sometimes, the Kāt. Ś. takes a view opposite to that of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā but the words are often almost the same.

The Vārtikas of Kātyāyana on Pāṇini and the Mahābhāṣya show that Mīmāṁsā technical terms and doctrines had been elaborated long before them. For example, the Vārtikas employ the technical Mīmāṁsā terms '*prasajyapratiṣedha*' (Vārtika 7 on Pāṇini I. 1. 44, Vārtika 5 on I. 2. 1, Vārtika 2. on VII. 3. 85), *paryudāsa* (Vārtika 3 on I. 1. 27), the word 'Śāstrātideśa' (in Vārtika on VII. 1. 96), the distinction between 'niyama' and 'vidhi' (in Vārtika 1 and 2 on III. 3. 163), the word 'prakaraṇa' (vārtika 4 on Vi. 2. 143). Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya is full of Pūrvamīmāṁsā matters. The word 'Mīmāṁsaka' occurs in bhāṣya on Pāṇini II. 2. 29. The Mahābhāṣya cites the well-known passage 'the five five-nailed animals may be eaten' and remarks that the sentence conveys that others than those five were not to be eaten.[1879] But Patañjali does not employ the word Parisaṅkhyā of which the above (five) is an example, according to mīmāṁsā works. Jaimini employs the word

---

(*Continued from last page*)

nara occurring in Ṛg. I. 98. 1. and I. 59. 6 the Nirukta (VII. 21-23) cites the views of 'ācāryāḥ', of the ancient Yājñikas (who held that Vaiśvānara means the sun in the sky) and of 'Śākapūṇi' (who holds that it means the terrestrial Agni). The Nirukta mentions the views of Yājñikas in V. 11, VII. 4 (where Yājñikas differ from the Nairuktas), in IX. 29 where the Nairuktas hold that Anumati and Rākā are wives of the gods while the Yājñikas held that these were the names of Paurṇamāsī), in XI. 31 (where a similar conflict between the views of the two interpreters of Sinīvālī and Kuhū is mentioned) and XI. 42–43 (where also the views of Yājñikas and Nairuktas are mentioned).

1879. भक्ष्यनियमेनाभक्ष्यप्रतिषेधो गम्यते। पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्या इत्युक्ते गम्यत एतदतोऽन्येऽभक्ष्या इति। महाभाष्य (ed. Kielhorn vol. I. p. 5). Compare शबर on जै. X. 7. 28 'किं तु परिसंख्यया प्रतिषेधः स्यात्। यथा पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्या इति शशादीनां पञ्चानां कीर्तनादन्येषां भक्षणं प्रतिषिध्यत इत्ययमर्थो वाक्येन गम्यते.' The five animals are: शल्यकः श्वाविधो गोधा शशः कूर्मश्च पञ्चमः॥ रामायण IV. 17. 39; मनु V. 18 adds खड्ग (rhinoceros) to these five. Vide या I. 177 for five and गौ. ध. सू. 17. 27 'पञ्चनखाश्च। शल्यकशशश्वाविङ्गोधाखड्गकच्छपाः' (अभक्ष्याः).

Parisaṅkhyā in VII. 3. 22. The Mahābhāṣya on IV. 1. 14 (vārtika 5) and on IV. 1. 93 (vārtika 9) gives valuable information viz. a brāhmaṇa woman is called 'Kāśakṛtsnā' if she studies the Mīmāṁsā expounded by Kāśakṛtsni.[1880] This establishes that in Patañjali's time a mīmāṁsā work composed by Kāśakṛtsni was in existence and women were found studying it. It is not certain what the Kāśakṛtsni-mīmāṁsā contained i. e. whether it was like the Pūrvamīmāṁsā of Jaimini or it was like the Uttaramīmāṁsā (Vedāntasūtra) or dealt with both mīmāṁsā and vedānta, which latter is not unlikely. The V. S. mentions the opinion of a teacher Kāśakṛtsna (in I. 4. 22), which Śaṅkarācārya regards as the final conclusion supported by the real import of Śruti. The son of Kāśakṛtsna might have been called Kāśakṛtsni (Pāṇini IV. 1. 95). The Vārtikas and Patañjali are full of the discussion of important matters on which the Mīmāṁsā has its own doctrines. In the Vārtikas 35 to 59 on Pāṇini I. 2. 64 (Sarūpāṇām-ekaśeṣa ekavibhaktau) there is a lengthy dicsussion on the question of the import of words, viz. whether it is *ākṛti* or *vyakti*. It is said in Vārtika 35 that, according to Vājapyāyana, ākṛti is the import of a word, while, according to Vyāḍi (in Vārtika 45 'dravyābhidhānam Vyāḍiḥ), *dravya* (or *vyakti*) is the import of a word (*pada*). The Mahābhāṣya notes that Pāṇini wrote some sūtras (such as I. 2. 58 'Jātyākhyāyām' &c) in which he accepted *jāti* as the import of words, while in other sūtras (such as I. 3. 64 'sarūpāṇām' &c) he

---

1880. काशकृत्स्निना प्रोक्ता मीमांसा काशकृत्स्नी काशकृत्स्नीमधीते काशकृत्स्ना ब्राह्मणी। महाभाष्य on पा. IV. 1. 14. If काशकृत्स्नि's मीमांसा dealt with पूर्वमीमांसा matters it is surprising that the extant पूर्वमीमांसासूत्र makes no reference to काशकृत्स्नि, when it names, besides जैमिनि, *nine* predecessors viz. आत्रेय, आलेखन (VI. 5. 17), आश्मरथ्य (VI. 5. 16), ऐतिशायन, कामुकायन, कार्ष्णाजिनि, बादरायण, बादरि and लाबुकायन. Dr. Umesha Mishra omits by oversight आश्मरथ्य from the list of the predecessors of जैमिनि in his 'critical bibliography of mīmāṁsā' added at the end of M. M. Jha's 'Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its sources.' काशकृत्स्नि's मीमांसा, being mentioned by पतञ्जलि, must be placed not later than 200 B. C. If काशकृत्स्नि wrote on पूर्वमीमांसा as is most likely, one would naturally expect that if the extant पूर्वमीमांसासूत्र was composed after 200 B. C. and about 200 A. D. (as both Jacobi and Keith propose) काशकृत्स्नि should have been mentioned by the पू. मी. सू. But if जैमिनि was earlier than काशकृत्स्नि or was a contemporary of the latter, then it would be natural if the पू. मी. सू. does not mention him. Therefore, though an argument from mere silence is not very strong, it is likely that the present P. M. S. was composed at least before 200 B. C.

accepted 'dravya' as the import of words.[1881] It is to be noted that, according to Jaimini (I. 3. 33 'ākṛtistu kriyārthatvāt), ākṛti is the import of words. On vārtika 3 on Pāṇ. IV. 1. 92 (Sāmānyacodanāstu viśeṣeṣu) Patañjali says that the vidhis declared with reference to certain things and objects in general really apply to individuals and he gives purely mīmāṁsā examples in this connection as set out in the note. The Vārtikakāra and Patañjali both use the word '*codanā*'[1882] in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā sense and give examples which are familiar to us from Śābarasbhāṣya. Among the purposes served by a study of grammar, *ūha* (which is the subject of the 9th chapter of PMS) is one. On Pāṇini I. 4. 3 Patañjali uses the language of Mīmāṁsā 'apurva eva vidhirbhaviṣyati na niyamaḥ.'

It appears that the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa was very much neglected from early times. There is a conflict of views about its authorship. The Nyāyapariśuddhi of Veṅkaṭanātha (I. H. Q. vol. IX. at p. 299) states that Kāśakṛtsna was the author of the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa. It appears from Śabara's bhāṣya that[1883] that Kāṇḍa existed in his day and was looked upon by him as Jaimini's work. Śaṅkarācārya in his bhāṣya on V. S. III. 3. 43 (pradānavadeva tad-uktam) mentions the Saṅkarṣa, quotes a sūtra therefrom, holds that it was known to the Vedāntasūtra and appears to convey that it was a work of Jaimini. Rāmānuja also appears to hold that Jaimini was the author of 16 chapters (comprising

---

1881. 'किं पुनराकृतिः पदार्थ आहोस्विद् द्रव्यम्। उभयमित्याह। कथं ज्ञायते। उभयथा ह्याचार्येण सूत्राणि पठितानि। आकृतिं पदार्थं मत्वा जात्याख्या... तस्याम् इत्युच्यते। द्रव्यं पदार्थं मत्वा सरूपाणाम्- इत्येकशेष आरभ्यते। महाभाष्य just before 'सिद्धे शब्दार्थसम्बन्धे' vol. I. p. 6 Kielhorn's ed.; आकृतौ शास्त्राणि प्रवर्तन्ते। ... आकृतिस्तु प्रत्येकं परिसमाप्यते। महाभाष्य *vol. II.* p. 392 (Kielhorn).

1882. चोदनायां चैकस्योपाधिवृत्तेः। वार्तिक 44 on पा. I. 2. 64; on which the महाभाष्य remarks 'चोदनायां चैकस्योपाधिवृत्तेर्मन्यामहे आकृतिरभिधीयत इति। आग्नेयमष्टाकपालं निर्वपेत्। चोदनासु च तस्यारम्भात्।'. वार्तिक 47 on I. 2. 64, on which the महाभाष्य comments 'चोदनासु च तस्यारम्भान्मन्यामहे द्रव्यमभिधीयत इति। गौरनुबन्ध्योऽजोऽग्नीषोमीय इति।'; कानि पुनः शब्दानुशासनस्य प्रयोजनानि। रक्षोहागमलघ्वसन्देहाः प्रयोजनम्। p. 1. of Kielhorn's edition; सामान्यचोदनास्तु विशेषेऽवतिष्ठन्ते। तद्यथा। गौरनुबन्ध्योऽजोऽग्नीषोमीय इत्याकृतौ चोदितायां द्रव्य आरम्भणालम्भनप्रोक्षणविशसनादीनि क्रियन्ते। पतञ्जलि on वार्तिक 3 on पा. IV. 1. 92.

1883. विधिनिगमभेदः प्रकृतौ कृतः। स्विष्टकृद्विकारश्च वनस्पतिरिति सङ्कर्षे वक्ष्यते। शबर on X. 4. 32 (p. 1934); यथा पत्नी तुल्यवत्सङ्ख्यायते इति सङ्कर्षे वक्ष्यति। शबर on जै. XII. 2. 11 (p. 2242); 'एवं तस्याभेदेऽप्याधेयांशापृथक्त्वादाध्यानपृथक्त्वमित्यर्थः। तदुक्तं 'नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानात्' इति। शङ्कर on वे. सू. III. 3. 43. Vide Siddha-Bhāratī part II pp. 102–105 for some sūtras from Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa and Intro. to Tattvabindu pp. 12–13.

the twelve called Pūrvamīmāṁsā and the four forming the Saṅkarṣa). The Kalpatarupariṁala of Appayyadīkṣita on V. S. III. 3. 43, while conceding that the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa was undertaken for discussion about *devatās*, insists that it is a pariśiṣṭa (supplement) of the P. M. S. of twelve chapters consisting as it does of discussions on several topics treated in the P. M. S. and being of a miscellaneous nature, that it does not begin with nor conclude with the discussion about devatās and that its first sūtra is 'anuyajatīti anuvaṣaṭkāraś-codyate'. Since the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa has had hardly any influence on Dharmaśāstra works no further reference need be made to it in this work.[1884]

Later medieval writers look upon the mīmāṁsāśāstra as the most important of vidyāsthānas (other than the Vedas), since it removes the ignorance, doubts and mistaken notions about the sense of several (Vedic) passages, and since all vidyāsthānas require its aid for the determination of the nature of their real meaning.[1885]

In some works like the bhāṣya of Rāmānuja on V. S. and the Prapañcahṛdaya[1886] the Mīmāṁsāśāstra is stated to be as one whole containing twenty adhyāyas (chapters) and we are told that there was a (bhāṣya) commentary called Kṛtakoṭi on the whole of it by Bodhāyana, that later on a concise commentary was composed by Upavarṣa, that Devasvāmin wrote a commentary

---

1884. Vide a paper by Pandit V. A. Ramaswami Shastri in I. H. Q. vol. IX. pp. 290–299 on Saṅkarṣa as a supplement to the P. M. S.

1885. प्रातिस्विकानेकवाक्यार्थगततत्त्वज्ञानसंशयविपर्ययव्युदासेन पारमार्थिकार्थसतत्त्वस्वरूपनिर्णयार्थं समस्तैरप्येभिर्विद्यास्थानैरभ्यर्थ्यमानत्वात्तेभ्योपि मीमांसाख्यविद्यास्थानं गरीयस्तरम्। तथा ह्याहुः। चतुर्दशसु विद्यासु मीमांसैव गरीयसी। जैमिनीयसूत्रार्थसंग्रह of ऋषिपुत्र-परमेश्वर *part.* I *p.* 2 (T. S. S.).

1886. तत्र साङ्गोपाङ्गस्य वेदस्य पूर्वोत्तरकाण्डसंभिन्नस्याशेषवाक्यार्थविचारपरायणं मीमांसाशास्त्रम्। तदिदं विंशत्यध्यायनिबद्धम्। तत्र षोडशाध्यायनिबद्धं पूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्रं पूर्वकाण्डस्य धर्मविचारपरायणं जैमिनिकृतम्। तदन्यदध्यायचतुष्कमुत्तरमीमांसाशास्त्रमुत्तरकाण्डस्य ब्रह्मविचारपरायणं व्यासकृतम्। तस्य विंशत्यध्यायनिबद्धस्य मीमांसाशास्त्रस्य कृतकोटिनामधेयं भाष्यं बोधायनेन कृतम्। तद्ग्रन्थबाहुल्यभयादुपेक्ष्य किंचित्संक्षिप्तमुपवर्षेण कृतम्। तदपि मन्दमतीन्प्रति दुष्प्रतिपादं विस्तीर्णत्वादित्युपेक्ष्य षोडशलक्षणपूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्रस्य देवस्वामिनातिसंक्षिप्तं कृतम्। भवदासेनापि कृतं जैमिनीयभाष्यम्। प्रपञ्चहृदय (T. S. S. pp. 38–39; तदाह वृत्तिकारः। वृत्तात्कर्माधिगमादनन्तरं ब्रह्मविविदिषेति। वक्ष्यति च कर्मब्रह्ममीमांसयोरैकशास्त्र्यं संहितमेतच्छारीरकं जैमिनीयेन षोडशलक्षणेनेति शास्त्रैकत्वसिद्धिः। श्रीभाष्य p. 2 (Bom. S. S.). Vide ABORI vol. X. pp. 153–54 for the author's paper on Bhavadāsa as a predecessor of शबर. भवदास is named in श्लोकवार्तिक (प्रतिज्ञासूत्र verse 63) and the न्यायरत्नाकर on p. 133 states that भवदास split पू. मी. सू. I. 1. 4 into two. Vide Intro. to तत्त्वबिन्दु pp. 19–20 for भवदास.

on 16 chapters and Bhavadāsa also composed a commentary on Jaimini, but that Śabara wrote a bhāṣya only on the first 12 chapters and did not comment on Saṅkarṣa. In I.H.Q. (vol. 15 pp. 262–263) reference is made to an inscription of Rājarāja (999 A. D.) which records the gift of certain lands to a learned brāhmaṇa who was to provide to four pupils board and teaching in several subjects, one of which is specified as the mīmāṁsā of twenty adhyāyas. These 20 chapters are made up as follows:—12 chapters (each divided into four *pādas*, except chapters III, VI and X, each of which has eight pādas, in all sixty pādas) ascribed to Jaimini, 4 chapters called Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa and 4 chapters constituting the Vedāntasūtra. The twelve chapters often called Pūrvamīmāṁsā make an extensive work containing 915 or about one thousand adhikaraṇas (according to different writers) and about 2700 sūtras, dealing with numerous topics and laying down important rules of vedic interpretation. Yāj. (in I. 3) means by Mīmāṁsā probably the work of Jaimini in 12 chapters. Many writers such as Mādhavācārya [1887] speak of two Mīmāṁsās, Pūrva and Uttara, respectively comprising the 12 chapters ascribed to Jaimini and the four chapters forming the Vedāntasūtra. Śaṅkarācārya refers to the extant Pūrvamīmāṁsā as Dvādaśalakṣaṇī in his bhāṣya on Vedāntasūtra III. 3. 26, as 'Prathamatantra' in bhāṣya on V. S. III. 3. 25, III. 3. 53 and III. 4. 27, as Prathama-kāṇḍa in bhāṣya on V. S. III. 3. 1, III. 3. 33, III. 3. 44, III. 3. 50, as Pramāṇalakṣaṇa in bhāṣya on V. S. III. 4. 42. On V. S. III. 3. 53 he speaks of the first pāda of the P. M. S. as 'Śāstrapramukha eva prathame pāde' and thereby conveys that he regards that the PMS and VS form one entire śāstra.

From here onwards up to note 1890 the discussion is also comprised (though a little more briefly) in the present author's paper on 'Pūrvamīmāṁsā, Brahmasūtra &c' contributed to the Prof. De Felicitation volume (pp. 119–139).

There are very difficult and controversial questions about the authorship of the extant Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtra and of the extant Vedāntasūtra (or Brahmasūtra) and their relation to each other. All of them cannot be gone into here. The first matter to be noted is that, though the number of the Vedāntasūtras is only about 1/5th of the number of the P. M. S., the V. S. contains

1887. ये पूर्वोत्तरमीमांसे ते व्याख्यायातिसंग्रहात्। कृपालुर्माधवाचार्यो वेदार्थं वक्तुमुद्यतः॥ Intro. verse 4 to the Com. on the ऋग्वेद (Poona ed.), Some mss. read सायणाचार्यो for माधवाचार्यो.

more personal references (i. e. 32) than the P. M. S. (i. e. 27). In the 2nd place, we find that the Vedāntasūtras mention Jaimini eleven times and Bādarāyaṇa nine times, while the P. M. S. names Bādarāyaṇa and Jaimini only five times each. The question arises whether Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa were contemporaries and, if not, what the relation between the two was. Scholars are generally agreed that they were not contemporaries. There is a tradition of some antiquity contained in the Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa[1888] according to which Jaimini was a pupil of Pārāśarya Vyāsa. It has been shown above (p. 857, note 1390) how the Purāṇas declare that Vyāsa Pārāśarya, also called Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana, arranged the one Veda into four and imparted the Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, Sāmaveda and Atharvaveda respectively to Paila, Vaiśampāyana, Jaimini and Sumantu. In the Mahābhārata Sumantu, Jaimini, Vaiśampayana, Paila are stated along with Śuka (the son of Vyāsa) to be the pupils of Vyāsa; vide Sabhā 4. 11 and Śāntiparva 328, 26–27 (cr. ed. 314, 23–24, 29) and 350. 11–12 (cr. ed. 337. 11–12). In the *tarpaṇa* provided for in the Āśvalāyanagṛhyasūtra (III. 4. 4) occurs the very interesting passage 'Sumantu-Jaimini-Vaiśampāyana-Paila-Sūtra-bhāṣya-Bhārata—Mahābhārata—Dharmācāryāḥ.' The above passages make it clear that several centuries before the Christian era Jaimini's was an honoured name and connected with the Sāmadeva. Scholars have examined the references to Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa in the P. M. S. and the V. S. Prof. K. A. Nilankanta Sastri in I. A. Vol. 50 pp. 167–174 on Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa arrives at the somewhat startling conclusion that there were three Jaiminis. T. R. Chintamani on p. 14 of the supplement to J. O. R. Madras, Vol. XI agrees with Prof. Nilakanta Sastri. Jaimini is named five times in the extant P. M. S. viz. at III. 1. 4, VI. 3. 4, VIII. 3. 7, IX. 2. 39, XII. 1. 7. Commonsense requires us to hold that these five

---

1888. सोऽयं प्राजापत्यो विधिस्तमिमं प्रजापतिर्बृहस्पतये बृहस्पतिर्नारदाय नारदो विष्वक्सेनाय विश्वक्सेनो व्यासाय पाराशर्याय व्यासः पाराशर्यो जैमिनये जैमिनिः पौष्पिण्ड्याय पौष्पिण्ड्यः पाराशर्यायणाय पाराशर्यायणो बादरायणाय बादरायणस्ताण्डि-शाट्यायनिभ्यां ताण्डिशाट्यायनिनौ बहुभ्यः &c.। सामविधानब्रा. (at end). The न्या. र. on श्लोकवा. (प्रतिज्ञासूत्र v. 23) sets out the गुरुपरम्परा of पूर्वमीमांसा as ब्रह्मा-प्रजापति-इन्द्र-आदित्य-वसिष्ठ-पराशर-कृष्णद्वैपायन-जैमिनि. The युक्तिस्नेहप्रपूरणी p. 8 (in Chowkhamba series) gives two similar गुरुक्रमs slightly differing from that of the सामविधानब्रा° and from each other. The गुरुपरम्परा is practically useless up to वसिष्ठ. It may be noted that in the सामविधान° Jaimini is said to be the disciple of Vyāsa Pārāśarya while between Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa intervene two other names.

references about Jaimini must have been made to the same person. If two different Jaiminis were intended by the P. M. S. (other than its own author) in the five sūtras a clear warn ing would have been given by the author. As shown below a sūtra should leave no ambiguity. Prof. Sastry holds that Jaimini mentioned in VI. 3. 4 is different from the Jaimini in the other four passages, because Śabara does not employ the word ācārya for qualifying Jaimini on VI. 3. 4 as he does in the four other cases and because the view put forward in VI. 3. 4 appears to be Pūrvapakṣa, while in the four other cases Jaimini's view is the siddhānta view of the Mīmāṁsā-sūtra. The number of sūtras in which Jaimini is named is very small (only 5), out of which the word ācārya is applied to Jaimini by Śabara in four places and not so applied in one. This is a very slender and inadequate ground for holding that the Jaimini in P. M. S. VI. 3. 4 is different from the Jaimini named in four other places. The usages of ācāryas as to employment of qualifying words like 'ācārya' or 'bhagavat' to authors mentioned by them differ. Kumārila applies no epithet like 'ācārya' or 'bhagavān' to Jamini and in one place [1889] charges Jaimini with composing sūtras containing not much substance. In the sūtras in which Jaimini is named in the VS (viz. in I. 2. 28, I. 2. 31, I. 3. 31, I. 4 18, III. 2. 40, III. 4. 2, III. 4. 18, III. 4. 40, IV. 3. 12, IV. 4. 5, IV. 4. 11) Śaṅkarācārya adds the qualification 'ācārya' in all except on III. 4. 40, although Jaimini propounds many propositions not acceptable to Bādarāyaṇa the author of V. S. or to Śaṅkara. In III. 4. 40, however,[1890] he omits the qualification 'ācārya' as regards both Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa. No one has argued that because the word ācārya does not qualify Bādarāyaṇa in III. 4. 40, the Bādarāyaṇa in that sūtra is different from the Bādarāyaṇa named in other sūtras. In another place (on V. S. IV. 1. 17) it may be noted Śaṅkarācārya remarks that both Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa are in agreement that certain acts of the *kāmya* type are of no help in

---

1889. 'सन्ति च जैमिनेरेवंप्रकाराण्यनत्यन्तसारभूतानि सूत्राणि।' तन्त्रवार्तिक p. 895 (on उपवीतं लिङ्गदर्शनात् सर्वधर्मः स्यात्, which is the first of six sūtras after III. 4. 9 that were omitted by Śabara).

1890. The sūtra is 'तद्भूतस्य तु नातद्भावो जैमिनेरपि नियमातद्रूपाभावेभ्यः' वे. सू. III. 4. 40 on which Śaṅkara remarks: जैमिनेरपीत्यपिशब्देन जैमिनिबादरायणयोरत्र संप्रतिपत्तिं शास्ति प्रतिपत्तिदार्ढ्याय. This means that बादरायण is the author of III. 4. 40 (in which बादरायण is not named at all) and therefore of the entire Vedānta-sūtra.

attaining real knowledge of brahma. This shows that according to Śaṅkara, Jaimini had treated of how brahma-vidyā arises. As regards the second reason, it does not clearly or indisputably appear that VI. 3. 4 is a pūrvapakṣa view. In that *adhikaraṇa* the Pūrvapakṣa is stated in the first sūtra [1891] viz. as to such *nitya* rites as Agnihotra or Darśapūrṇamāsa a man who can carry out all the details in their entirety is alone entitled to engage in them. The 2nd sūtra states the *siddhānta* view that, as regards *nitya* acts, it is not absolutely necessary that one should be able to perform all details (aṅgas) therein; the third sūtra only states that smṛti declares that it is a fault if the principal rite is not performed and therefore the principal rite being obligatory must be performed. Then comes the 4th sutra in which the name of Jaimini occurs. Śabara's bhāṣya on this sutra is extremely meagre (2½ lines in print) and not clear. The Ṭup-ṭīkā does not comment separately on each of the sūtras of VI. 3. 1-7, [1892] it omits the name of Jaimini in its explanation and its concluding words on this adhikaraṇa appear to support the interpretation of the 4th sūtra advanced by the present author. No one doubts that sūtras 5-7 support the siddhānta view. If VI. 3. 4 were a pūrvapakṣa sūtra, it is expected that sūtra 5 should contain the word 'tu' or 'api vā' in order to indicate that it refutes the

---

1891. सर्वशक्तौ प्रवृत्तिः स्यात्तथाभूतोपदेशात्। अपि वाप्येकदेशे स्यात्प्रधाने ह्यर्थनिर्वृत्तिर्गुणमात्रमितरत्तदर्थत्वात्। तदकर्मणि च दोषस्तस्मात्ततो विशेषः स्यात्प्रधानेनाभिसम्बन्धात्। कर्माभेदं तु जैमिनिः प्रयोगवचनैकत्वात् सर्वेषामुपदेशः स्यादिति। अर्थस्य व्यपवर्गित्वादेकस्यापि प्रयोगे स्याद्यथा क्रत्वन्तरेषु। पू. मी. सू. VI. 3. 1-5. It appears that the अध्वरमीमांसाकुतूहलवृत्ति by Vāsudeva-dīkṣita (ms. in the Madras Govt. Oriental Mss. Library) reads कर्मभेदं for कर्माभेदं and अर्थव्यपवर्गित्वात् in sūtras 4 and 5. I am indebted to Dr. V. Rāghavan for this reference. In a complete ms (22 A in Prof. Velankar's Catalogue p. 317 No. 1091) of the bhāṣya of Śabara in the Bombay Asiatic Society's Mss. Library on VI. 3. 1 the words जैमिनिर्मन्यते स्म are omitted and कर्मभेदं is read for कर्माभेदम्. The word 'upadeśa' in the 4th sūtra *may be taken in the same sense in which it is used in* PMS I. 1. 5 'autpattikastu... tasya jñānam-upadeśaḥ' or in the general sense of 'instruction'.

1892. The टुप्टीका on पू. मी. सू. VI. 3. 4 appears to make this clear 'सूत्रकारो नित्ये इतिकर्तव्यतामिच्छति। ...एवं च साङ्गं यावज्जीवं न शक्नोति कश्चिदपि कर्तुमिति कृत्वा यावच्छक्नुयादित्युपनिबध्यते। शक्तस्य कामतो वैगुण्यं स्यात्।'. The last sentence means 'if one, being able to finish an obligatory rite with all details, omits some part at his sweet will, then there would be defect in the rite itself'.

view expressed in sūtra 4. What that sūtra means is that the dropping of some aṅga in the *nitya* rite does not make that rite a different one from the same *nitya* rite when performed with all aṅgas, since the text about its performance (with all aṅgas or with some aṅgas) is one and the same and the vedic instruction is that all aṅgas have to be done (if possible). Interpreted thus, that sūtra is not a pūrvapakṣa at all, but only emphasizes the siddhānta with additional reasons. The upshot would be that Jaimini mentioned five times in PMS is only one person and that he is a different person (who had written on P. M.) from the reputed author of the extant PMS.

A parallel may be cited. Śaṅkarācārya makes one adhikaraṇa of sūtras 26-33 of V. S. I. 3 (*devatādhikaraṇa*) which establishes that not only men but gods are qualified to study the Vedāntaśāstra and names Bādarāyaṇa twice in the same adhikaraṇa (in I. 3. 26 and 33) and in I. 3. 33 he employs the word 'tu' because that sūtra is a reply to Jaimini's view contained in I. 3. 31-32. Similarly, the PMS puts forward the siddhānta view in VI. 3. 2 and names Jaimini in VI. 3. 4 for the same purpose.

Even Prof. Sastry admits that in four out of the five references where Jaimini is expressly named, his views are the siddhānta views. The cases of PMS IX. 2. 3 and XII. 1. 59 are somewhat remarkable. The adhikaraṇa in both cases consists of only one sūtra, which is the siddhānta view and Jaimini is expressly named therein. In PMS III. 1. 4 Jaimini differs from Bādari (III. 1. 3) and two more sūtras are added to complete the adhikaraṇa. In PMS VIII. 3. 7 Jaimini's view is opposed to that of Bādari (VIII. 3. 6), is the siddhānta view and there is no separate sūtra setting forth the view of the author of the PMS.

From the remarks of Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. III. 4. 40 (quoted in note 1890) it follows that he regarded Bādarāyaṇa as the author of the Vedāntasūtra. In V.S. III. 2. 38-39 the Siddhānta is stated that the rewards of actions are given by Īśvara (God), while Jaimini's view is that it is Dharma that gives the rewards of actions (III. 2. 40) and in the next sūtra (III. 2. 41) it is stated that Bādarāyaṇa holds the former view (or that the former of the two, Īśvara and Dharma, gives the reward is the view of Bādarāyaṇa). Here Bādarāyaṇa is expressly mentioned as holding the same view as that in the Siddhāntasūtra III. 2. 38.

The observations of Śaṅkarācārya in introducing[1893] the last sūtra of the VS make it perfectly clear that he regarded Bādarāyaṇa as the author of the entire Vedāntasūtra. No satisfactory explanation is offered why it was necessary to mention Bādarāyaṇa nine times in the VS when all the 555 sūtras thereof are deemed to have been composed by Bādarāyaṇa, or why it was necessary to mention in a work containing about 2700 sūtras all deemed to be composed by Jaimini, the views of Jaimini five times when in all cases or at least in four out of the five cases the views are identical with the reputed author of the PMS. Only two theories are possible viz. to hold that there is no explanation or to hold that there were two Jaiminis and two Bādarāyaṇas.

The problem of the author of the VS is rather complicated. Bhāskara (like Śaṅkara) holds that Bādarāyaṇa is the author of VS, since he begins his commentary on VS with an obeisance to Bādarāyaṇa who sent forth (into the world) the Brahmasūtra that brings about the cessation of the bondage of birth. The Pañcapādikā of Padmapāda (a disciple of Śaṅkarācārya) performs (in the 2nd Introductory verse) an obeisance to Bādarāyaṇa.[1894] Rāmānuja, on the other hand, makes confusing statements. In the 2nd verse of his introduction to the Śrībhāṣya[1895] on VS he calls upon all good men to drink the nectar-like words of Pārāśarya, but in his bhāṣya on VS II. 2. 42 he holds that Bādarāyaṇa was the author of the Mahābhārata, wherein the Pāñcarātra-śāstra is expounded at great length (in Śāntiparva chap. 334–339 = cr. ed. 321 ff.) as also of the VS[1896]. But Yāmunācārya, the preceptor of the teacher

---

1893. नन्वेवं सति सातिशयत्वादन्तवत्त्वमैश्वर्यस्य स्यात्ततश्चैषामावृत्तिः प्रसज्येतेत्यत उत्तरं भगवान् बादरायण आचार्यः पठति—अनावृत्तिः ... शब्दात्। शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. IV. 4. 22.

1894. नमः श्रुतिशिरःपद्मषण्डमार्तण्डमूर्तये। बादरायणसंज्ञाय मुनये शमवेश्मने॥ पञ्चपादिका 2nd Intro. verse (Madras Govt. series, 1958).

1895. कथमेवं ब्रुवाणो बादरायणो वेदविदग्रेसरो वेदान्तवेद्यपरब्रह्मभूतवासुदेवोपासनार्चनादिप्रतिपादनपरस्य सात्वतशास्त्रस्याप्रामाण्यं ब्रूयात्। p. 509 of श्रीभाष्य (B. S. S.) on वे. सू. II. 2. 42.

1896. यद्यपि भगवता बादरायणेन इदमर्थान्येव सूत्राणि प्रणीतानि विवृतानि च तानि परिमितगम्भीरभाषिणा भाष्यकृता विस्तृतानि च तानि गम्भीरन्यायसागरभाषिणा श्रीवत्साङ्कमिश्रेणापि०। सिद्धित्रय (Chow. S. S.) pp. 5–6.

of Rāmānuja, ascribes the VS to Bādarāyaṇa. In spite of Śaṅkarācārya, Vācaspati-miśra, author of the famous Bhāmatī on [1897] Śaṅkarācārya's bhāṣya on VS, makes an obeisance to Vedavyāsa, the author of Brahmasūtra The Parāśara-mādhavīya is in two minds; in vol. I part I pp. 52, 97, vol. II part 2 pp. 3 and 275 Bādarāyaṇa is said to be the author of the VS, but in a few other places VS is spoken of as Vyāsasūtra (vol. I. part 1, pp. 56, 113). The above conflict of testimony gives rise to the important question whether Bādarāyaṇa, the supposed author of the Vedāntasūtras, is identical with Veda-vyāsa or is different from him. Śaṅkarācārya's bhāsya points to the conclusion that in his opinion at least they are different.[1898] For example, on V. S. I. 3. 29 he quotes a verse of Vedavyāsa in support of the proposition of the VS that the Veda is eternal. On VS II. 3. 47, in support of the proposition that, though the individual soul is an aṁśa of the Supreme Self, the latter is not at all affected by the suffering of the individual soul, Śaṅkara quotes two verses as smṛti from the Mahābhārata. This makes it clear that, if the author of the VS was identical with Veda-vyāsa, the author of the Mahābhārata, Śaṅkarācārya would not have cited the latter as an independent smṛti source supporting the former or would at least have used some such language as 'this very author has said elsewhere that' &c. The same reasoning would apply to Śaṅkarācārya's comments. If that great ācārya was of the opinion that the author of the VS was the same as that of the Mahābhārata and the Gītā he would not have cited passages from the Epic and the Gītā as Smṛtis supporting the reasoning of the VS.

If it were contended that there is only one Jaimini (and not two, much less three) a serious difficulty arises. Why should the author of PMS (containing about 2700 sūtras) refer to him-self by name in five places only. The usual explanation offered

---

1897. ब्रह्मसूत्रकृते तस्मै वेदव्यासाय वेधसे। ज्ञानशक्त्यवताराय नमो भगवतो हरेः॥ भामती, 5th Intro. verse.

1898. अत एव च नित्यत्वम्। वे. सू. I. 3. 29; भाष्य 'वेदव्यासश्चैवमेव स्मरति। 'युगान्तेऽन्तर्हितान्वेदान्सेतिहासान्महर्षयः। लेभिरे तपसा पूर्वमनुज्ञाताः स्वयम्भुवा॥' इति. This verse is शान्तिपर्व 210. 19 (cr. ed. 203. 17); स्मरन्ति च। वे. सू. II. 3. 47; भाष्य "स्मरन्ति च व्यासादयो यथा जैवेन दुःखेन न परमात्मा दुःखायत इति। 'तत्र यः परमात्मा हि स नित्यो निर्गुणः स्मृतः। न लिप्यते फलैश्चापि पद्मपत्रमिवाम्भसा॥ कर्मात्मा त्वपरो योऽसौ मोक्ष-बन्धैः स युज्यते। स सप्तदशकेनापि राशिना युज्यते पुनः॥' इति". These two are शान्तिपर्व 352. 14–16 (cr. ed. 339. 14–15).

by some commentators when Pāṇini names[1899] his predecessors, viz. that they are named for showing his reverence for them, would be of no avail as to Jaimini, since it cannot be said that the author of PMS Jaimini shows respect to himself. When Jaimini mentions Bādarāyaṇa in I. 1. 5 and XI. 1. 65 Śabara[1900] explains this is done for showing respect to Bādarāyaṇa or for spreading his fame. Another explanation that ancient authors often refer to themselves in the 3rd person will not do. Why should the author of about 2700 sūtras choose five places only for referring to himself. Therefore, one is compelled to hold that, if Jaimini is the author of the extant PMS and mentions the views of Jaimini five times only, there was a predecessor and namesake of his called Jamini who had expressed his views in a different work.

There are eleven sūtras in the VS in which the views of Jaimini are referred to. They are (as stated above) VS I. 2. 28 and 31, I. 3. 31, I. 4. 18, III. 2. 40, III. 4. 2, III. 4. 18, III. 4. 40, IV. 3. 12, IV. 4. 5, IV. 4. 11. Out of these eleven there are six references to Jaimini (viz. I. 2. 28, I. 2. 31, I. 4. 18, IV. 3 12, IV. 4. 5, IV. 4. 11) for which no corresponding *adhikaraṇa* or sūtra in the PMS can be pointed out, while sūtras III. 2. 40, III. 4. 2, III. 4. 18 attribute views to Jaimini, which are well-known doctrines of the PMS. VS I. 3. 31 corresponds to PMS VI. 1. 5 and on III. 4. 40 (quoted in note 1890 above) Jaimini and VS agree. Therefore, it appears that the Jaimini who expresses views on purely Vedāntic topics and whose views are not found in PMS composed a work on Vedānta.

There are in VS nine sūtras in which Bādarāyaṇa is named viz. in VS I. 3. 26 and 33 (Bādarāyaṇa being twice named in the same *adhikaraṇa* as opposed to Jaimini), III. 2. 41, III. 4. 1, III. 4. 8, III. 4. 19, IV. 3. 15, IV. 4. 7, IV. 4. 12. It may be noted that in all these cases (except in IV. 3. 15) the views ascribed to Bādarāyaṇa are opposed to those of Jaimini or are slightly different (only VS IV. 4. 7 and IV. 4. 12). Prof. Nilakanta Sastri thinks that all the views mentioned as Bādarāyaṇa's are the views of the author of the VS who employs

---

1899. On तृपि-मृषिकुशेः काश्यपस्य (पा. I. 2. 25) the महाभाष्य says 'काश्यपग्रहणं किमर्थम्। काश्यपग्रहणं पूजार्थम्'.

1900. बादरायणग्रहणं बादरायणस्येदं मतं कीर्त्यते बादरायणं कीर्तयितुं नात्मीयं मतं पर्युदसितुम्। शबर on पू. मी. सू. I. 5 p. 25; बादरायणग्रहणं कीर्त्यर्थं नैकीयमतार्थम्। शबर on पू. मी. सू. XI. 1. 65.

the third person for himself as ancient authors do (I. A. vol. 50 at p. 169). This does not afford a satisfactory explanation of the question why it was necessary to invoke Bādarāyaṇa's name in nine cases only for buttressing up the position of the author of the VS (that has 555 sūtras). If the author of the VS and Bādarāyaṇa named nine times are identical, the name of Bādarāyaṇa should ordinarily appear towards the end of the *adhikaraṇa* and not in the middle. Two examples may be cited here to illustrate how VS deals with references to Bādarāyaṇa. In III. 2 38-41 (which is one *adhikaraṇa*) the *siddhānta* view is first stated with reasons in III. 2. 38-39, then Jaimini's view is cited (III. 4. 40) and then Bādarāyaṇa is mentioned as agreeing with the view first put forth 'pūrvam tu Bādarāyaṇo hetuvyapadeśāt), the difference being that the *siddhānta* is based upon 'upapatti' while Bādarāyaṇa relies upon 'hetuvyapadeśa' (in śruti and smṛti). This shows that different reasons were assigned by the author of VS and by Bādarāyaṇa for the same proposition. VS. III. 4. 18-20 form one *adhikaraṇa* about *sannyāsa*. Jaimini starts the pūrvapakṣa that the Chān. Up. (II. 23. 1 'trayo dharmaskandhāḥ') only makes a passing reference to the āśramas, there is no vidhi (injunction) in that text and there is no exposition also. Then Bādarāyaṇa's view is cited 'anuṣṭheyaṁ Bādarāyaṇaḥ sāmyaśruteḥ' i. e. *sannyāsa* should be resorted to just as one resorts to the householder's stage. Then comes the view of the author of the VS that there is a vidhi of *sannyāsa* in that text. If Bādarāyaṇa and the author of VS be held identical, why was it necessary to add the sūtra 'vidhirvā dhāraṇavat' (VS III. 4. 20) after stating Bādarāyaṇa's view? It would be also noticed that the reasons given in the two sūtras differ. In VS IV. 4. 10-14 first the views of Bādari and Jaimini on Chān. Up. VIII. 2. 1, 5 are set out, then Bādarāyaṇa's view is set forth (in IV. 4. 12) and then two more sūtras are added by the author of VS. Therefore, these illustrations show that, though the final conclusion of Bādarāyaṇa and the author of VS is the same, the language and the reasons are different, and that Bādarāyaṇa named in the VS was a predecessor of the author of the extant VS that had composed a work on Vedānta, whom the author of the VS strengthens with reasons of his own.

In Pāṇini's time there were mendicant ascetics (bhikṣus) who studied the 'Bhikṣusūtra of Pārāśarya' or 'the Bhikṣusūtra of Karmanda' and were designated 'Pārāśariṇaḥ' and

'Karmandinaḥ'.[1901] A bhikṣu represents the order of *Sannyāsa.* Therefore, a Bhikṣusūtra must have had as its subject sannyāsa, the time for it, the rules of the order, the final goal to be attained and so on. The Bṛ. Up. (III. 5. 1 and IV. 4. 22) emphasizes that those who realize *brahma* give up all desires and practise begging. The Gautama-dharmasūtra[1902] says the same thing. No trace is found of the Bhikṣusūtra of Karmanda. But it is possible to say that the Bhikṣusūtra propounded by Pārāśarya must have been somewhat like the extant Brahmasūtra or one of its predecessors. This would be the earliest reference to a sūtra by Pārāśarya on the sannyāsāśrama. The date of Pāṇini is not beyond dispute. But no modern scholar would place him after 300 B. C. The present writer would place him as early as at least 500 or 600 B. C. The result would be that the Bhikṣusūtra of Pārāśarya named by Pāṇini would have to be placed at some time between 400 B. C. to 700 B. C. Further light is shed by Vārtika[1903] (1) on Pāṇini IV. 1. 97, from which it follows that Vyāsa's '*apatya*' (son) was called Vaiyāsaki, that is Śuka (according to the Mahābhāṣya). Bādarāyaṇa is formed from Badara which is a word in the Naḍādi-gaṇa (consisting of about 76 words), according to Pāṇini IV. 1. 99 (Naḍadibhyaḥ phak), Bādari being the son of Badara, Bādarāyaṇa being the grandson (or a remoter male descendant) of Badara. At some period Vyāsa and Bādarāyaṇa came to be confounded and Śuka, who was the son of Vyāsa according to the Vārtika and the Mahābhāṣya, came to be called Bādarāyaṇi (son of Bādarāyaṇa) as shown by the Bhāgavatapurāṇa (XII. 5. 8 where Śuka is said to be 'Bhagavān Bādarāyaṇiḥ'). It appears that from the 9th century A. D. Bādarāyaṇa came to be confounded with Vyāsa Pārāśarya.

1901. पाराशर्यशिलालिभ्यां भिक्षुनटसूत्रयोः । कर्मन्दकृशाश्वादिनिः। पा. IV. 3, 110–111; पाराशर्येण प्रोक्तं भिक्षुसूत्रमधीयते पाराशरिणो भिक्षवः, कर्मन्देन प्रोक्तं भिक्षुसूत्रमधीयते कर्मन्दिनो भिक्षवः। सि. कौ. It is possible that Pāṇini refers to a sūtra work on ancient Sāṅkhya by Pañcaśikha. This will be briefly discussed in another chapter below. It will be shown later from the Mahābhārata that Pañcaśikha was called bhikṣu and Pārāśarya (vide note 2186 below).

1902. ब्रह्मचारी गृहस्थो भिक्षुर्वैखानसः। ...अनिचयो भिक्षुः। ...भिक्षार्थी ग्राममियात्। गौतमधर्मसूत्र III. 2. 10–13.

1903. सुधातुरकङ् च। पा. IV. 1. 97; सुधातृव्यासयोः वार्तिक; सौधातकिः। वैयासकिः शुकः। महाभाष्य.

A brief examination of the citation of the views of Bādarāyaṇa and Jaimini in the PMS and the Brahmasūtra[1904] is necessary. Bādarāyaṇa is named only five times by the P. M. sūtra as said above. (1) In P. M. S. I. 1. 5 the author claims that he and Bādarāyaṇa are agreed on the eternity and infallibility of the Veda; (2) In P. M. S. V. 2. 17-20, there is a discussion on Nakṣatreṣṭi. In the model sacrifice there are certain homas called Nāriṣṭha; the question is whether in the modifications of the model wherein certain subordinate homas colled *upahomas* are prescribed, the Nāriṣṭha homas precede or follow the Upahomas. The *siddhānta* view is that Nāriṣṭhahomas precede, Ātreya being of the opposite view and Bādarāyaṇa supporting the *siddhānta*. (3) In P. M. S. VI. 1. 8 Bādarāyaṇa's view is that not men alone but women also are entitled to take part in *kratus* (Vedic sacrifices) and this is the *siddhānta* of the P. M. S.; (4) P. M. S. X. 8. 35-46 make an extensive *adhikaraṇa* in which the question is whether the texts prescribing Āgneya and Aindrāgna *puroḍāśas* in Darśapūrṇamāsa for a sacrificer who has not performed soma sacrifice constitute a vidhi (of the two) or only an anuvāda, Bādarāyaṇa's view in PMS. X. 8. 44 being that its is a *vidhi* and the *siddhānta* being that there is an anuvāda (X. 8. 45). (5) PMS XI. 1. 54-67 constitute a lengthy *adhikaraṇa* and the discussion concerns the question whether *āghāra* and other aṅgas are to be repeated with each of the principal matters (Āgneya and others) in Darśapūrṇamāsa or are to be performed only once.

With regard to these five cases where Bādarāyaṇa is cited in the P. M. S. three points emerge, viz. the author of the P. M. S. agrees with Bādarāyaṇa's view in all except in X. 8. 44 (where the two differ), that the view attributed to Bādarāyaṇa in P. M. S. I. 1. 5 has correspondence with the views of the V. S. (1. 3. 28-29) and that four views out of five refer to purely sacrificial matters to which nothing corresponds in the V. S. It follows that the author of the extant P. M. S. had some work of Bādarāyaṇa dealing with Pūrvamīmāṁsā matters before him and that, if Bādarāyaṇa be the author of the extant V. S., the latter had composed a work on Pūrvamīmāṁsā matters also or that there was another Bādarāyaṇa who wrote only on Pūrva-

---

1904. Prof. Nilakant Sastry's paper referred to above is valuable, but several of his conclusions set out on p. 172 of I. A. vol. 50 cannot be accepted by the present writer, who regrets that Prof. Sastry did not consider much other matter relevant to the points discussed by him.

mīmāṁsā. The five references to Jaimini in P. M. S. have been noted above and the sūtra VI. 3. 4, which led Prof. Sastry to postulate three Jaiminis, has been already explained as not necessarily leading to any such conclusion.

Another alternative might be put forward viz. that works by Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa did not exist before the extant V. S. and P. M. S., but that the references to Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa concern views current in the schools of Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa. But this is not a likely hypothesis. The extant V. S. and P. M. S. are meant for all throughout Āryāvarta and it is not likely that the oral traditions of two schools were supposed to be known to all and sundry in the whole of the country.

In several cases where Bādarāyaṇa is mentioned, the extant V. S. makes certain additions and explanations. It has been shown above that Śaṅkarācārya, Bhāskara and Yāmuna ascribe the V. S. to Bādarāyaṇa and that Vācaspati and others hold that Vyāsa Pārāśarya is the author of V. S. It is difficult to explain how Vedavyāsa came to be identified with Bādarāyaṇa after the 9th century A. D. Some other relevant matters have also to be considered. A verse about *kṣetra* and *kṣetrajña* in the Bhagavadgītā raises a problem. In Gītā[1905] 13. 4 it is said ' this

---

1905. ऋषिभिर्बहुधा गीतं छन्दोभिर्विविधैः पृथक् । ब्रह्मसूत्रपदैश्चैव हेतुमद्भिर्विनिश्चितैः ॥ गीता 13. 4 ; the first half refers to the passages in the Vedas and Upaniṣads and the 2nd half to the Brahmasūtrapadas. ब्रह्मसूत्रपदैश्चैव must be connected with *gītam* according to all commentators. The present writer feels that the word ' ṛṣibhiḥ ' also must be understood in the second half of the verse. If ṛṣibhiḥ is required to be connected with ' chandobhiḥ ', there is no reason why that word should not be connected with ' Brahmasūtrapadaiḥ ' also. Two words in the instrumental are employed in the first half (viz. ṛṣibhiḥ (agents) and ' chandobhiḥ ' (means); if we understand ' ṛṣibhiḥ ' in the 2nd half, we shall have a symmetrical arrangement viz. ' ṛṣibhiḥ ' (agents) and ' Brahmasūtrapadaiḥ ' (means). There is a contrast between Vedic and Upaniṣadic passages in the first half and Brahmasūtra passages that are well reasoned and definite in the 2nd half. Then the meaning will be that sages had composed several Brahmasūtras. The author is inclined to hold that the Gītā refers to several Brahmasūtras current in its day and not to the extant Vedāntasūtra. Here commentators other than Śaṅkarācārya understand by the word ' Brahmasūtra ' the work going under that name in these days. The late Lokamānya Tilak in his Marathi ' Gītārahasya ' discusses (in appendix part 3 pp. 527-534 of the ed. of 1915) the question of the relation of the Gītā and Brahmasūtra and puts forward his own surmise

(*Continued on next page*)

real nature of kṣetra and kṣetrajña has been separately sung (i. e. propounded) in many ways by the sages in different vedic hymns (or metres) and by the words of the Brahmasūtra that are full of reasoning and that arrive at definite conclusions'. Here the Gītā expressly mentions Brahmasūtra. If one turns to the extant Brahmasūtra (or Vedāntasūtra), it is found that in many sūtras reliance is placed on smṛti, which is taken to mean the Gītā by all ācāryas. For example, on 'Smṛtiśca' (V. S. I. 2. 6) the only Smṛti passages cited by Śaṅkarācārya are Gītā 18. 61 and 13. 2. Similarly, on 'api ca smaryate' (V. S. I. 3. 23) Śaṅkara cites only Gītā 15. 6 and 12; on 'api ca smaryate' (V. S. II. 3. 45) the only Smrti passage quoted by Śaṅkara is Gītā 15. 7; on 'Smaranti ca' (V. S. IV. I. 10) only Gītā 6. 11 is quoted; on 'Yoginaḥ prati ca smaryate smārte caite' (V. S. IV. 2. 21) Gītā 8. 24–25 alone are set forth as the passages meant to be explained. Therefore, though the Bhagavadgītā is not expressly named in the Brahmasūtra, the ācāryas are agreed that the Bhagavadgītā alone is relied upon and referred to in all the above-mentioned sūtras. We have, therefore reached this position that the Gītā mentions the Brahmasūtra which must be held to be earlier than the Gītā, but as Gītā passages are declared to be at the basis of some of the Vedāntasūtras, the Gītā must be earlier than the V. S. This is contradictory; Śaṅkarācārya,[1906] who saw the contradiction, therefore explained 'Brahmasūtrapadaiḥ' as passages (of Upaniṣads) that suggest (i. e. propound) doctrines about brahma (i. e. he interprets 'sūtra' as meaning 'sūcaka'). But this explanation is far-fetched and has not been accepted by other commentators. Therefore, other theories have to be put forward viz. that the author of both is the same or that the Mahābhārata and Gītā were receiving accretions from time to time and that when the

---

(*Continued from last page*)

that the author who composed the extant Brahmasūtra redacted the original Mahābhārata and Gītā and gave them both the present form. The present writer regrets that he cannot accept this surmise of the late Lokamānya. It may be pointed out that Prof. R. D. Karmarkar in (ABORI vol. III. pp. 73–79) did not accept Lokamānya's explanation of 'Brahmasūtrapadaiḥ' and held that in Gītā 13. 4 the word 'Brahmasūtrapadaiḥ' does not refer to the Bādarāyaṇa sūtras but refers to some similar other works. But he did not pursue that matter further.

1906. ब्रह्मणः सूचकानि वाक्यानि ब्रह्मसूत्राणि तैः पद्यते गम्यते ज्ञायते इति तानि पदान्युच्यन्ते। तैरेव च क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोर्याथात्म्यं 'गीतम्' इत्यनुवर्तते। 'आत्मेत्येवोपासीत' इत्यादिभिर्हि ब्रह्मसूत्रपदैरात्मा ज्ञायते। शङ्कर on गीता 13. 4.

final redaction of the Mahābhārata (including the Gītā) was made the verse about Brahmasūtra was inserted in the Gītā or that in the times of the Gītā there were several works called Brahmasūtra other than the extant one.

The present writer thinks it highly probable that the Gītā had before it several works called Brahmasūtras and in 13. 4 refers to them and not to the extant Brahmasūtra of Bādarāyaṇa. A brief examination of the authors mentioned in the PMS and VS is necessary. Both these works mention by name several individual authors (besides Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa). Both PMS and VS mention the following:—

Ātreya - PMS IV. 3. 18, V. 2. 18, VI. 1. 26 and VS III. 4. 44;

Āśmarathya - PMS VI. 5. 16 and VS I. 2. 29, I. 4. 20;

Kārṣṇājini - PMS IV. 3. 17, VI. 7. 35 and VS III. 1. 9.

Bādari - PMS III. 1. 3, VI. 1. 27, VIII. 3. 6, IX. 2. 33 and VS. I. 2. 30, III. 1. 11, IV. 3. 7, IV. 4. 10;

PMS also names Ālekhana (VI. 5. 17), Aitiśāyana (III. 2. 44, III. 4. 24, VI. 1. 6), Kāmukāyana (XI. 1. 58 and 63) and Lāvukāyana (VI. 7. 37), these being not mentioned at all in the VS. On the other hand VS mentions Auḍulomi (I. 4. 21, III. 4. 45, IV. 4. 6) and Kāśakṛtsna (I. 4. 22), both being absent from PMS. The PMS very rarely refers to some ācāryas as 'eke' in I. 1. 27 and IX. 3. 4; V. S. has 'eke' in I. 4. 9 and 18, II. 3. 43, III. 2. 2. and 13, III. 4. 15, IV. 2. 13 and 'ekeṣām' in I. 4. 13, IV. 1. 17, IV. 2. 13 and 'anye' in III. 3. 27, in all of which the reference in V. S. is to other recensions of the Veda or Upaniṣads, while in III. 4. 42 'eke' refers to ācāryāḥ and in III. 3. 53 'eke' refers to Lokāyatikas. Vyāsa or Pārāśarya is not mentioned by name in PMS or VS. The case of Bādari requires careful consideration. The PMS mentions both Bādarāyaṇa and Jaimini only five times each, while PMS and VS mention (each) Bādari four times. Bādari differs from Jaimini on two important points viz. the denotation of the word 'śeṣa' and the remarkable view that even śūdras are entitled to perform *agnihotra* and other Vedic rites. In VS. Bādari is mentioned as differing from Jaimini on the *upāsanā* of Vaiśvānara in Chān. Up. V. 18. 1-2 and on the words 'sa enān brahma gamayati' (Chān. Up. IV. 15. 5) and in VS IV. 4. 10 Bādari is opposed to Jaimini about a released soul. It follows from this brief analysis and the mention of Bādari four times in PMS and also in VS that both the latter had before them a work of Bādari dealing with Pūrva-

mīmāṁsā matters and also with Vedānta. Ālekhana and Āśmarathya are both quoted at least 16 times in Āp. Śr. Sūtra, their views are quoted frequently as in conflict on the ritual of sacrifices and these are the only two individual authors quoted in Āp. Śr. S. It is likely that Ātreya, Āśmarathya and Kārsṇājini composed a work or works dealing with both systems and Auḍulomi (quoted thrice by VS) and Kāśakṛtsna composed works on the Vedānta. Vide Tantravārtika on I 3. 2 p. 169 note 2010 for the view that the present PMS was preceded by several efforts in the same direction.

From the above discussion it may very plausibly be held that the word 'Brahmasūtrapadaiḥ' in Gītā 13. 4 refers to some sūtra works such as those of Bādari, Auḍulomi, Āśmarathya and one or two others and not to the extant Brahmasūtra. No one can say that Bādari and Ātreya are not 'ṛṣis'. Śabara refers to Ātreya as 'Muni' on PMS VI. I. 26.

It should be remembered that Jaimini, Bādari and Bādarāyaṇa are gotra names. But Vyāsa is not a gotra name and Pārāśarya is one of the three *pravaras* of the group of Parāśaras.[1907]

The Āp. Śr. Sūtra 24. 8. 10 (ed. by Garbe) and the Pravaramañjarī (ed. by Chentsalrav, Mysore, 1900) p. 61 mention Bādarāyaṇa as a sub-section of Viṣṇuvṛddhagotra, while p. 38 of the latter work mentions Jaimini along with Yāska, Vādhūla, Mauna and others as having the pravara 'Bhārgava-vaitahavya-sāvataseti' and pp. 108 and 178 cite Bādari (or Vādari) as a sub-division of Parāśaras. Therefore, it was possible that several individuals separated by a century or more could bear the name of Jaimini or Bādarāyaṇa.

We have also to answer the observations of the Naiṣkarmyasiddhi of Sureśvarācārya (the most famous of the disciples of Śaṅkarācārya himself) that Jaimini does not mean that all passages of the Veda relate to sacrificial rites and that if he really meant that, he would not have composed 'Śārīrakasūtra' beginning with 'athāto brahma-jijñāsā' and 'janmādyasya yataḥ', containing an investigation of the purport of all Vedānta passages, laying bare the nature of brahma and supporting his words with profound reasoning; but that as a matter of fact he

---

1907. अथ पाराशराणां ऽयार्षेयः । वसिष्ठ-शाक्त्य-पाराशर्येति । पराशरवच्छक्तिवद्वसिष्ठवदिति । आप. श्रौ. सूत्र. 24. 10. 6.

did compose such a śārīrakaśāstra. This passage means that Jaimini composed a sūtra work called Śārīrakasūtra on the investigation and knowledge of brahma, which began with two sūtras that were the same as the first two sūtras of the extant Vedāntasūtra.[1908] Col. Jacob in his Introduction (p. 3) to the first edition of the Naiṣkarmyasiddhi thought that the Naiṣkarmyasiddhi made Jaimini the author of the Vedāntadarśana. He is inaccurate, since all that Sureśvara says is that Jaimini composed not only a sūtra work on the Karmamīmāṁsā but he also composed a work called Śārīrakasūtra on the doctrines of brahmamīmāṁsā, but he does not convey that the whole of the extant Vedāntasūtra is the work of Jaimini. Dr. Belvalkar[1909] postulates two propositions, viz. that there were brahmasūtras written separately for the Chāndogya Upaniṣad and the Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad and other Upaniṣads for each Śākhā and secondly, that the Śārīrakasūtra of Jaimini was bodily incorporated within and forms the main part of the contents of the present text of the Brahmasūtra. The present author takes strong objections to both these propositions. He cannot go into this question at length here but has to remark that these propositions are based on little evidence. If 'janmādyasya yataḥ' was also a sūtra of Jaimini who was specially connected with the Sāmaveda by the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas, why is it that that sūtra is supposed by the bhāṣyakāras as based on a passage of the Taittirīya-upaniṣad? The Chāndogya and Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣads are each nearly thrice as long as all the other eight Upaniṣads (out of the principal ten Upaniṣads) and six times longer than the Taittirīya Upaniṣad. Therefore, these two Upaniṣads figure largely in the discussions in the extant Brahmasūtra. The 2nd proposition is hardly more than a pure guess. There is no evidence to establish that the main part of the extant Vedāntasūtra is bodily taken from Jaimini's Śārīrakasūtra, when the latter has not come down to us and when no sūtras therefrom

---

1908. यतो न जैमिनेरयमभिप्राय आम्नायः सर्व एव क्रियार्थ इति। यदि ह्ययमभिप्रायोऽभविष्यद् अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा जन्माद्यस्य यतः—इत्येवमादिब्रह्मवस्तुस्वरूपमात्रयाथात्म्यप्रकाशनपरं गम्भीरन्यायसन्दृब्धं सर्ववेदान्तार्थमीमांसनं श्रीमच्छारीरकं नासूत्रयिष्यत्। असूत्रयच्च। तस्माज्जैमिनेरेवायमभिप्रायो यथैव विधिवाक्यानां स्वार्थमात्रे प्रामाण्यमेवमैकात्म्यवाक्यानामप्यनधिगतवस्तुपरिच्छेदसाम्यादिति। नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धि pp. 54-55 (ed. by Col. Jacob in B. S. S. 1906).

1909. Vide his 'Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy' pp. 141-142.

(other than the two noted above) are quoted anywhere as from Jaimini's Śārīrakasūtra.

Then some sūtras of VS in which the words 'tad-uktam'[1910] occur have to be considered. There are eight sūtras that contain those words. Śaṅkarācārya holds that in VS I. 3. 21, II. 1. 31, III. 3. 18 (where 'tad uktam' occur) the reference is to the preceding sūtras of the VS itself. On V. S. III. 3. 26, III. 3. 33, III. 3. 50 and III. 4. 42 Śaṅkarācārya holds that these respectively refer to PMS X. 8. 15, III. 3. 8, XI. 4. 10 and I. 3. 8-9 and that VS III. 3. 43 refers to a sūtra of the Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa. The other ācāryas differ from Śaṅkarācārya in several places and among themselves. Vallabhācārya, who had come to regard the Bhāgavata as of equal authority with the Veda and as even superseding the latter, holds that the words 'tad-uktam' in VS III. 3. 33, III. 3. 50 and III. 4. 42. refer to passages of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. The VS III. 3. 44 appears to echo the words and principles of PMS III. 3. 14.[1911] The words 'tad-uktam' should ordinarily mean the same thing throughout *i. e.* they should everywhere be taken as referring to the PMS or to VS. But no ācārya is prepared to accept entirely one of these two alternatives. It may further be noted that the extant P. M. S. very rarely employs the words 'tad-uktam' as in V. 3. 9 where it refers to PMS V. I. 19.[1912] The P. M. S., though it mentions Bādarāyaṇa five times, nowhere appears to be influenced by the V. S. On the other hand, not only are some of the sūtras of V. S. containing the words 'Tad-uktam' deemed to be references to the P. M. Sūtras, but the V. S frequently employs peculiar Pūrvamīmāṁsā words such as arthavāda, prakaraṇa, liṅga, vidhi, śeṣa and purely P. M. matters such as in III. 3. 26 (kuśāchandastutyupagānavat), III. 3. 33 (aupasadavat), III. 4. 20 (dhāraṇavat), IV. 4. 12 (Dvādaśāhavat). Therefore, the extant VS very much presupposes the P. M. S., while the latter cannot be said to have been influenced by VS to any noticeable extent.

The present author now wishes to draw together the separate threads that have been spun so far about Vyāsa, Jaimini,

---

1910. Vide a brief note 'The problem of Tad-uktam Sūtras' by Prof. P. M. Modi in I. H. Q. Vol. 13 pp. 514-520.

1911. Compare 'लिङ्गभूयस्त्वात्तद्धि बलीयस्तदपि' वे. सू. III. 3. 44 with 'श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यानां समवाये पारदौर्बल्यमर्थविप्रकर्षात्' पू. मी. सू. III.3.14.

1912. अन्ते वा तदुक्तम् । पू. मी. सू. V. 3. 9. This refers to V. 1. 19 (अन्ते तु बादरायणस्तेषां प्रधानशब्दत्वात्). In पू. मी. IX. 2. 2 occur the words 'तदुक्तदोषम्' which refer to पू. मी. VII. 2. 13.

Bādarāyaṇa, the PMS and the VS and tries to present a tentative pattern of conclusions as follows:—

1. The Mahābhārata and some Purāṇas state that Jaimini was a pupil of Pārāśarya Vyāsa. But this is said in relation to the transmission of the Sāmaveda to Jaimini and therefore must be confined to that matter alone (and not extended to other matters) in accordance with the mīmāṁsā maxim 'yāvad-vacanam vācanikam.' We have got a Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, a Jaiminīya Śrauta-sūtra and Gṛhya-sūtra. The tradition about the imparting of Sāmaveda to Jaimini may be true and at present there is no evidence to show that it is wrong. There is, however, no warrant for extending this tradition to the reputed authors of the PMS and the VS. Late medieval writers like Vallabhācārya, whose weakest points were lack of correct knowledge of history and chronology and the obsession to glorify to the skies their favourite authors and works, extended the above tradition about the Sāmaveda to the authors of the two sūtra works,[1913] viz. PMS and VS. From the above discussion it follows that the extant PMS is earlier than the extant VS and that the author of the extant PMS could not have been a disciple of the author of the extant VS. The medieval writers failed to pay proper attention to the fact that Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa are also gotra names and not merely individual names.

2. From Pāṇini we know that there were two *bhikṣu-sūtras* composed by Pārāśarya and Karmanda before his time. Patañjali mentions a mīmāṁsā work composed by Kāśakṛtsna. There is, therefore, no doubt that sūtra works on 'bhikṣus' and mīmāṁsā had come to be composed several centuries before the Christian era.

3. From the examination of the views of Jaimini mentioned in the extant VS it appears that Jaimini composed a work on Vedānta also. Some corroboration is lent to this view by the remarks of the Naiṣkaramyasiddhi quoted on p. 1175 above. There is nothing to show that this Jaimini was a pupil of Bādarāyaṇa or of Pārāśarya. On the contrary, the words 'Jaiminer-api' in VS. III. 4. 40 convey great solicitude on the part of the author of the extant VS for Jaimini's support. The author of the

---

1913. On तत्तु समन्वयात् (V. S. I. 1. 4) वल्लभाचार्य says: तथा हि जैमिनिर्धर्मजिज्ञासामेव प्रतिज्ञाय तत्प्रतिपादकस्य पूर्वकाण्डस्य समन्वयमाह। अवान्तरवाक्यानां प्रकारशेषत्वात्। न च सर्वस्मिन् वेदे धर्म एव जिज्ञास्यस्तद्वदुत्तरेण व्यासेन ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाः प्रतिज्ञातत्वात्।

extant VS shows special respect for Jaimini's views, since he quotes Jaimini more times than other ācāryas (including Bādarāyaṇa). It becomes necessary to hold that there were two authors named Jaimini, one dealing with both PM and Vedānta subjects and the other deemed to be the author of the extant PMS. This Jaimini is different from Jaimini deemed to be the author of the extant PMS.

4. The fact that PMS mentions five times Bādarāyaṇa's views, four of which are concerned with purely sacrificial matters and the fact that the VS mentions Bādarāyaṇa nine times in connection with Vedānta matters, leads to the inference that Bādarāyaṇa must have composed a work dealing with PM and Vedānta topics. That work has not come down to us. This Bādarāyaṇa is different from the Bādarāyaṇa regarded by Śaṅkarācārya and others as the author of the extant VS. Thus there are two authors named Bādarāyaṇa.

5. The author of the extant VS was, according to Śaṅkarācārya, Bhāskara and some other early bhāṣyakāras, also Bādarāyaṇa, but from about the 9th century A. D. onwards he came to be confounded with Vedavyāsa.

6. So far as the PMS and VS are concerned, there are only two Jaiminis (and not three, as Prof. Sastry holds in I. A. vol. 50 p. 172) and two Bādarāyaṇas.

The present section is concerned mainly with the influence of Pūrvamīmāṁsā doctrines and methodology on Dharmaśāstra works. But it must be mentioned here that Pūrvamīmāṁsā works from that of Jaimini onwards also rely upon smṛtis and Dharmaśāstra. A few examples may be cited. The PMS I. 3 deals with the limits of the authoritativeness of smṛtis, PMS VI. 7. 6 mentions the word 'Dharmaśāstra'. The P. M. S. expressly relies on smṛti in support of its propositions (as in XII. 4. 43). On PMS VI. 1. 12 Śabara quotes a smṛti verse, which is almost the same as Manu VIII. 416 and Ādiparva (82. 23 = Cr. Ed. 77. 22). Śabara frequently quotes Dharmasūtras and metrical smṛtis to elucidate and strengthen his arguments; e. g. Śabara on PMS VI. I. 10 quotes Āp. Dh. S. II. 6. 13. 11 and states on PMS VI. I. 15 that the sale of a daughter mentioned in the smṛtis is not approved of by *śiṣṭas.*[1914] It is not necessary to cite further

1914. विक्रयो हि श्रूयते शतमतिरथं दुहितुमते दद्यात्, आर्षे गोमिथुनम्-इति। शबर on VI. 1. 10 and 'स्मार्त च श्रुतिविरुद्धं विक्रयं नानुमन्यन्ते' on PMS. VI. 1. 15. Vide

(*Continued on next page*)

examples to support the proposition stated above. Those interested may consult the present author's paper on "Gleanings from Śabara and the Tantravārtika' JBBRAS vol. 26 (old series, 1924) pp. 83–98 and on 'Tantravārtika and Dharmaśāstra' in JBBRAS, New series, vol. 1 and 2 for 1925 (pp. 95–102).

We must now turn to the Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtra itself. In relation to every śāstra there are what are called four *anubandhas* (indispensable elements) [1915] viz. *Viṣaya* (the subject to be treated of), *prayojana* (the purpose or object), *sambandha* (the relation of the śāstra to the prayojana) and *adhikārin* (the person entitled or competent to study the śāstra). The Ślokavārtika [1916] remarks 'as long as the purpose of any śāstra or of any undertaking (or act) whatever is not declared, so long no one will take it (i. e. study or do it).' Therefore, the very first sūtra of the PMS puts forward the subject (viṣaya) and the purpose of the śāstra (prayojana).[1917] That sūtra states 'next, therefore, (should be undertaken) the investigation and consideration of dharma'. The *sambandha* of this śāstra with the *prayojana* is that of *sādhya* (the object to be attained) and *sādhana* (the means of attaining) i. e. this śāstra is the means of attaining the knowledge of dharma. Therefore, as remarked by the Śāstra-

---

(Continued from last page)

आप. ध. सू. II. 6. 13. 11 for the first sentence and मनु III. 53 for 'आर्षे गोमिथुनं शुल्कम्'; on P. M. S. VI. 8. 18 शबर quotes यथैव स्मृतिः, धर्मे... नातिचरितव्येति, धर्मप्रजासंपन्ने दारे नान्यां कुर्वीतेति च। एवमिदमपि स्मर्यत एव, अन्यतरापायेऽन्यां कुर्वीतेति।; आप. ध. (II. 5. 11. 12–13) has the two सूत्रs, धर्मप्रजा... कुर्वीत and अन्यत... कुर्वीत (with slight variations).

1915. The four अनुबन्धs in the case of the पूर्वमीमांसा may be briefly put as 'शास्त्रे धर्मादिर्विषयः, तदवबोधः प्रयोजनं, त्रैवर्णिकोऽधिकारी, विषयविषयिभावाद्यः सम्बन्धाः'.

1916. सर्वस्यैव हि शास्त्रस्य कर्मणो वापि कस्यचित्। यावत्प्रयोजनं नोक्तं तावत्तत्केन गृह्यते॥ श्लोकवा. (प्रतिज्ञासूत्र) 12. q. by बालक्रीडा on या. I. 1. p. 2.

1917. अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासासूत्रमाद्यमिदं कृतम्। धर्माख्यं विषयं वक्तुं मीमांसायाः प्रयोजनम्॥ श्लोकवा. (प्रतिज्ञासूत्र) v. 11. अथ means आनन्तर्य i. e. after the study of the Veda from a guru that has already taken place. The शास्त्रदीपिका says (p. 12) 'तत्सिद्धमध्ययनादनन्तरं धर्मजिज्ञासा कर्तव्येति। सा चतुर्विधा धर्मस्वरूप-प्रमाण-साधन-फलैः।'. The न्यायरत्नाकर comments on verse 18 (of प्रतिज्ञासूत्र) 'योयं पूर्वोक्तेन प्रयोजनेन सह शास्त्रस्य साध्यसाधनसम्बन्धः स एव शास्त्रारम्भहेतुः.' Compare the well-known maxim 'प्रयोजनमनुद्दिश्य न मन्दोऽपि प्रवर्तते' found in श्लोकवा. (सम्बन्धाक्षेप-परिहार v. 55). Writers of the Prābhākara School hold that the word dharma in P. M. S. I. 1. 2 means 'Vedārtha'. Vide Ṛjuvimalā-pañcikā on Bṛhatī (p. 20) 'चोदनासूत्रेण चोदनालक्षणः कार्यरूप एव वेदार्थः, न सिद्धरूप इति प्रतिज्ञातम्। तदनेन भाष्येण व्याख्यायते। धर्मशब्दश्च वेदार्थमात्रपरः।'.

dīpikā (on P. M. S. II. 1. 1), the proper subject of this śāstra is Dharma and not the meaning of the Veda (tasmād dharma ityeva śāstraviṣayo na vedārtha iti). The *adhikārin* is one who has studied the Veda or a part of it from a guru and is treated of at length in the 6th chapter of the P. M. S.

The Mīmāṁsāsūtra does not state how much of the Veda has to be studied before one enters on understanding the meaning of it. Here the Smṛtis come to one's help. Gautama II. 51–53 prescribes several options viz. twelve years for one Veda or 12 years for each of the four vedas or so long as he can commit to memory (one Veda). Manu III. 1–2 are similar viz. one should study vedas for 36 years under a guru or for 18 years or nine years or for as many years as would be required for committing Veda to memory and they permit the option of studying the three Vedas or two Vedas or one Veda. Yāj. I. 36 remarks that Vedic studenthood lasts 12 years for each Veda or five (for each Veda) or some sages say for as many years as the student would require to master (one Veda or more). But even these prescriptions must have been rather a tall order for many brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas and vaiśyas. Further, the Mīmāṁsā requires that not only should a person of the three *varṇas* (classes) study the Veda but he must also engage in understanding its meaning. On PMS I. 1. 1 Śabara states that the venerable Yājñikas do not [1918] declare that rewards result from the mere study (memorizing) of the Veda and that where the Vedic texts appear to assign a reward for the mere memorizing of Veda they are merely arthavādas (intended only to praise Veda study), as in Tai. Ār. II. 15 which states[1919] 'whatever (vedic texts about a), sacrifice he memorizes the result is that he, as it were actually performs that, and he secures absorption into (or communion with) Agni, Vāyu, Sūrya. The Tai. Up. I. 9 attaches the greatest importance to *svādhyāya* (memorizing the Veda) and *pravacana* (teaching it or expounding it) and after stating the views of two sages cites the view of Nāka Maudgalya that svādhyāya and pravacana are the most important to be resorted to or striven for, though ṛta, satya, dama, śama, agnihotra, hospitality and others may be combined with them, the reason

---

1918. न च तस्याध्ययनमात्रात्तत्रभवन्तो याज्ञिकाः फलं समामनन्ति। शबर on I. 1. 1.

1919. तस्मात्स्वाध्यायोऽध्येतव्यो यं यं क्रतुमधीते तेन तेनास्येष्टं भवत्यग्नेर्वायोरादित्यस्य सायुज्यं गच्छति। तै. आ. II. 15; ऋतं च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च ... सत्यमिति सत्यवचा राथीतरः। तप इति तपोनित्यः पौरुशिष्टिः। स्वाध्यायप्रवचने एवेति नाको मौद्गल्यः। तद्धि तपः तद्धि तपः। तै. उ. I. 9.

being that those two constitute *tapas.* The PMS in III. 8.18 (jñāte ca vācanam na hy-avidvān vihitosst i) provides that only he who knows the Veda has adhikāra for performing sacrifices. Śabara[1920] raises the question how much of the Veda must a man know in order to be entitled to perform a vedic sacrifice and replies that he must have memorized as much of the veda as would enable him to carry to its completion the vedic sacrifice undertaken by him. The Tantravārtika on the same sūtra adds that the whole veda is to be studied during the period of studenthood, but if anyone is unable to memorize the whole veda, but somehow only the portion on Agnihotra and Darśapūrṇamāsa, then it cannot be said that he has no adhikāra for performing those two. To memorize the Veda and also to study its meaning was a formidable task. Many verses of the Veda had a threefold application with reference to sacrifices (adhiyajña), with reference to the deities (adhidaivata or adhidaiva) and adhyātma (with reference to the spiritual or metaphysical meaning). Vide Nir. III. 12 (where Ṛg. I. 164. 21 is explained in two ways, adhidaivata and adhyātma), X. 26 (where Ṛg. X. 82. 2 is explained in two ways, adhidaivata and adhyātma), XI. 4 (where Ṛg. X. 85. 3 is explained in adhiyajña and adhidaivata ways), XII. 37 (where Vāj. S. 34. 55 is explained in the adhidaivata and adhyātma ways), XII. 38 (where Atharva X. 8. 9 is explained in adhidaivata and adhyātma ways). Manu (VI. 83) lays down the *japa* (muttering) of Veda of the adhiyajña, ādhidaivika and ādhyātmika types. Manu I. 23 and Vedāṅgajyotiṣa say that the mantras of the three vedas were drawn from Agni, Vāyu and Sūrya for the carrying out of yajñas. Viśvarūpa on Yāj. I. 51[1921] explains the words 'vedam vratāni vā pāram nītvā' as memorizing the Veda and completely understanding its meaning and not merely memorizing it. Dakṣa says that Vedābhyāsa (study of the Veda) comprehends five[1922]

1920. न ह्यविद्वान् विहितोऽस्ति। यो ह्यविद्वान्नासावधिकृतः सामर्थ्याभावात्। ... कियता पुनर्विदितेन विद्वानधिक्रियत इति। यावता विदितेन शक्तो भवति यथोक्तं क्रतुमभिनिर्वर्तयितुं तावद्यो वेद स तेन क्रतुनाधिक्रियते।... सर्वे क्रतवः कथं ज्ञायेरन् पृथक् पृथगिति कृत्स्नस्य वेदस्याध्ययनं श्रूयते। शबर on पू. मी. सू. *III. 8. 18;* अवश्यं ब्रह्मचर्यकाल एव समस्तो वेदोऽध्येतव्यः। यदि तु कश्चिदशक्तो नाधीते सकलम्, अग्निहोत्रदर्शपूर्णमासमात्रं कथंचिदधिगच्छति न तत्र तस्यानधिकारः। तन्त्रवा. p. 1122 on same sūtra.

1921. वेदस्य पारनयनमर्थतो ग्रन्थतश्च स्वीकरण न ग्रन्थत एव। विश्वरूप on या I. 51.

1922. वेदस्वीकरणं पूर्वं विचारोऽभ्यसनं जपः। तद्दानं चैव शिष्येभ्यो वेदाभ्यासो हि पञ्चधा॥ दक्षस्मृ. II. 34, q. by मिता० on या. III. 310 (without name), अपरार्क p. 126 on या. I. 99 (from दक्ष).

matters viz. first memorizing it, reflection over it, constant repetition of it, *japa* and imparting it to pupils. These were ideals attained by a few persons only, while most brāhmaṇas generally rested content with memoriznig one Veda or a portion of it.

The Pūrvamīmāṁsāśāstra is the most extensive of all the *darśanas*.[1923] Śāstra is that which regulates and declares (human) activities and abstentions by means of eternal words (Veda) or by works composed by men.[1924] And it has about 2700 sūtras and over 900 adhikaraṇas (called *nyāyas* or conclusions on topics for discussion). Some sūtras are often repeated such as 'Liṅgadarśanāc-ca' (which occurs about 30 times) and 'tathā cānyārthadarśanam' (that occurs about 24 times). An adhikaraṇa is described as having five constituents, viz. (1) the topic for discussion, (2) the doubt about it, (3) the *prima facie* view, (4) the refutation of the prima facie view, (5) the final conclusion.[1925] A sūtra (aphorism) should be concise[1926] (contain a few letters), but clear in its meaning, substantial, of wide application (lit. facing all directions), should be without pauses or interjected letters and should be faultless. A bhāṣya is that which sets out the meaning of the sūtra in sentences that follow the words of the sūtra and that makes its own contribution (to the elucidation of the subject of the sūtra), while a vārtika is one that considers what is stated in the sūtra, or what

---

1923. The Darśanas are many, as appears from the सर्वदर्शनसंग्रह of माधवाचार्य, but the orthodox and famous darśanas are six and run in pairs, viz. न्याय and वैशेषिक, सांख्य and योग, पूर्वमीमांसा and उत्तरमीमांसा. In I. A. vol. 45 pp. 1-6 and 17-26, it is stated that the सर्वदर्शनसंग्रह was not composed by माधवाचार्य who became later on Vidyāraṇya, but was composed by a nephew of माधवाचार्य, who was a son of सायण (at pp. 22 ff.)

1924. प्रवृत्तिर्वा निवृत्तिर्वा नित्येन कृतकेन वा। शासनाच्छंसनाच्चैव शास्त्रमित्यभिधीयते॥ भामती on वे. सू. I. 1. 3, which is quoted by परा. मा. II. 2 p 288 as from a पुराण. The first half is श्लोकवा. (शब्दपरिच्छेद v. 4).

1925. विषयो विशयश्चैव पूर्वपक्षस्तथोत्तरम्। निर्णयश्चेति पञ्चाङ्गं शास्त्रेऽधिकरणं स्मृतम्॥ q. by तिथितत्त्व p. 92, अधिकरणकौमुदी of रामकृष्ण (Chowkhamba series), सर्वदर्शनकौमुदी p. 89 (T. S. S.). Some read निर्णयश्चेति सिद्धान्तः, others like माधवाचार्य set out the five as विषय, विशय (or सन्देह), सङ्गति, पूर्वपक्ष and सिद्धान्त.

1926. अल्पाक्षरमसन्दिग्धं सारवद्विश्वतोमुखम्। अस्तोभमनवद्यं च सूत्रं सूत्रविदो विदुः। (पञ्चपादिका of पद्मपाद p. 82, ब्रह्माण्ड II. 33. 58, वायु 59. 142, युक्तिदीपिका p. 3 which explains अस्तोभं as अपुनरुक्तं). The पञ्चपादिका quotes this verse as from पौराणिकs and remarks 'सर्वतोमुखमिति नानार्थतामाह' and the com. says 'अर्थैकत्वादेकं वाक्यमिति न्यायस्य सूत्रान्यविषयत्वात् न वाक्यभेदः'.

is omitted or what is not well stated.[1927] The Kāvya-mīmāṁsā of Rājaśekhara defines the words sūtra, bhāṣya, vṛtti, ṭīkā, kārikā &c. in chap. II.

Having declared in the first sūtra that after a person has studied the Veda and because he has done so, PMS proceeds to say that he should start on the consideration of what dharma[1928] is. The 2nd sūtra, therefore, defines 'dharma as an act conducive to a man's highest good, that is characterized by an exhortative (vedic) text.' Śabara explains that 'codanā' means a sentence that urges or exhorts a person to do an act. So this conveys that the means of knowledge (pramāṇa) as regards dharma are vedic sentences and it also means that what is characterized or indicated by *codanā* is dharma i. e. the nature (svarūpa) of Dharma is made manifest. The word 'artha' is put in to exclude acts (from being designated dharma) that may be mentioned in the veda but the result of doing which is evil, such as the sentence 'one practising black magic (to harm a person) may perform the *Śyena* sacrifice.' This is not dharma, but adharma, since the practice of black magic is condemned as sinful. This vedic sentence does not say that one should inflict injury, it only says that śyenayāga brings about injury and if one desires to inflict injury, śyena is the means.[1929] The Ślokavārtika remarks that the words, 'codanā', 'upadeśa' and 'vidhi' are synonyms according to

---

1927. सूत्रार्थो वर्ण्यते यत्र वाक्यैः सूत्रानुसारिभिः। स्वपदानि च वर्ण्यन्ते भाष्यं भाष्यविदो विदुः।. भामती on ब्रह्मसूत्र I. 1. 1 quotes a verse 'लघूनि सूचितार्थानि स्वल्पाक्षरपदानि च। सर्वतः सारभूतानि सूत्राण्याहुर्मनीषिणः॥' q. by युक्तिदीपिका p. 3; उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तचिन्ताकरं वार्तिकम्। आनन्दगिरि on बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्भाष्यवार्तिक p. 7 quotes a verse 'उक्तानुक्ताद्विरुक्तादिचिन्ता यत्र प्रवर्तते। तं ग्रन्थं वार्तिकं प्राहुर्वार्तिकज्ञा मनीषिणः॥' Should we read दुरुक्तादि for द्विरुक्तादि ?

1928. शबर says 'एवमधीतो वेदो धर्मजिज्ञासायां हेतुर्ज्ञातः, अनन्तरं धर्मो जिज्ञासितव्य इत्यतःशब्दस्य सामर्थ्यम्।'; the न्या. र. says एतदुक्तं भवति। वेदाध्ययनादनन्तरमस्य एवाधीतवेदत्वात्कारणात् तदर्थं धर्मजिज्ञासा कर्तव्येति' (on v. 112 of प्रतिज्ञासूत्र of श्लोकवा°).

1929. तस्माच्चोदनालक्षणोऽर्थः श्रेयस्करः। ... य एव श्रेयस्करः स धर्मशब्देनोच्यते। उभयमिह चोदनया लक्ष्यते अर्थोऽनर्थश्चेति। कोऽर्थः, यो निःश्रेयसाय ज्योतिष्टोमादिः। कोऽनर्थः, यः प्रत्यवायाय श्येनो वज्र इषुरित्येवमादिः। तत्र अनर्थो धर्म उक्तो मा भूदिति अर्थग्रहणम्। कथं पुनरसावनर्थः। हिंसा हि सा हिंसा च प्रतिषिद्धेति। ... नैव श्येनादयः कर्तव्या विज्ञायन्ते। यो हि हिंसितुमिच्छेत् तस्यायमभ्युपाय इति तेषामुपदेशः। श्येनेनाभिचरन् यजेत इति हि समामनन्ति, न 'अभिचरितव्यम्' इति। शबर on I. 1. 2 at end. Vide पू. मी. सू. I. 4. 5 and III. 8. 36–38 for श्येनयाग which is a modification of ज्योतिष्टोम and पू. मी. सू. VII. 1. 13–16 for इषुयाग, where on VII. 1. 13 शबर quotes आप. श्रौ. 22. 7. 18 'समानमितरच्छ्येनेन.'

Śabāra, the bhāṣyakāra. The word 'vidhi' is often translated as injunction (i. e. an authoritative order) but in common parlance 'injunction' means 'restraining a person from doing something.' Therefore, the word, 'codanā' or 'vidhi' has often been translated in these pages as 'exhortatory passage or exhortation.' The result is that dharma means a religious act (a yāga) which confers highest good. In Ṛg. X. 90. 16 'yajña' is spoken of as the first (or ancient) dharma (yajñena yajñam-ayajanta devāstāni dharmāṇi prathamānyāsan) and Śabara (in the bhāṣya on P. M. S. I. 1. 2) quotes this verse for the proposition that the Veda expressly says that dharma means 'yāga'. That Vedas have been promulgated for yajña is stated by the Vedāṅga-jyotisa [1930] verse 3 (Vedā hi yajñārthamabhipravṛttāḥ). Medieval Dharmaśāstra writers like the Mitāksarā (on Yāj. II. 135), Dāyatattva (p. 172), Vy. M. (p. 157) quote a verse ascribed to Devala or Kātyāyana, which provides that all wealth is created for sacrifices, that, therefore, one should expend it on purposes of dharma and not on women, fools and irreligious people [1931] (vide H. of Dh. Vol. III. p. 609 n. 1155 for further passages of similar import and their application).

Śabara introduces the 2nd sūtra by saying that what is to be investigated and understood is what dharma is (i. e. what is its nature-svarūpa), what are its characteristics, what are the means of attaining it, what are deceptive (wrong) means of attaining it and what does it lead to (what the fruit or reward of knowing it is) and replies that the second sūtra explains the first two of these (viz. what dharma is and what its characteristics are [1932]).

1930. चोदना चोपदेशश्च विधिश्चैकार्थवादिनः। श्लोकवा. on औत्पत्तिकसूत्र v. 11, on which the काशिका remarks 'तत्र चोदना विधिपदपर्यायः शब्दविशेषो भाष्यकारस्याभिमत इत्याह चोदनेति। एतदुक्तं भवति — विधायकशब्द उपदेश इति.'

1931. यज्ञार्थं विहितं वित्तं तस्मात्तद् विनियोजयेत्। स्थानेषु धर्मजुष्टेषु न स्त्रीमूर्खविधर्मिषु॥ The मिता. on या. II. 135 strenuously opposes the proposition contained in this verse.

1932. स पुनः कथं जिज्ञासितव्यः। को धर्मः कथंलक्षणः। कान्यस्य साधनानि कानि साधनाभासानि किंपरश्चेति। तत्र को धर्मः कथंलक्षण इति एकेनैव सूत्रेण व्याख्यातम्... चोदनालक्षणो धर्मः इति। ... चोदना इति क्रियायाः प्रवर्तकं वचनमाहुः। आचार्यचोदितः करोमीति हि दृश्यते। लक्ष्यते येन तल्लक्षणम्। धूमो लक्षणमग्नेरिति हि वदन्ति। तया यो लक्ष्यते सोऽर्थः पुरुषं निःश्रेयसेन संयुनक्तीति प्रतिजानीमहे। शाबरभाष्य on I. 1. 2; again on II. 1. 1 'चोदना च क्रियाया अभिधायकं वाक्यं वाक्ये च पदानामर्थाः।'; श्लोकवा. 'तेन प्रवर्तकं वाक्यं शास्त्रेऽस्मिंश्चोदनोच्यते' चोदनासूत्र v. 3); तत्र यो धर्मः इत्युद्दिश्य स चोदनालक्षणश्चोदनाप्रमाण इति प्रमाणवचन इति प्रमाणवचनव्यक्तिः। यश्चोदनालक्षण इत्युद्दिश्य स धर्म इति स्वरूपवचनव्यक्तिः।

That is, 'codanās' (vedic hortatory texts) are the pramāṇa (means of knowledge) about dharma and whatever is laid down by hortatory vedic texts is dharma (i. e. Dharmasvarūpa). The relation of Dharma to the Veda and the Pūrvamīmāṁsā-śāstra is clearly and succinctly brought out in a verse of Kumārila himself as follows: [1933] "When discussion about the correct knowledge of Dharma is being carried on, Veda being the means of such knowledge, mīmāṁsā will supply complete information about the subject of the procedure or method.' Just as even if a man has good sight he cannot perceive anything unless there is light, so unless a man knows the methods laid down by PMS he cannot correctly judge what Dharma is. Jaimini then examines the means of knowledge (pramāṇas) and holds that except *śabda* (i. e. the Veda) there is no means of knowledge about Dharma. One cannot perceive directly what Dharma is i. e. Dharma is not *pratyakṣa*. All the other pramāṇas except śabda are based on pratyakṣa and therefore they cannot define or explain what Dharma is. According to Kumārila there are six pramāṇas, pratyakṣa (direct perception), anumāna (inference), upamāna (analogy), śabda, arthāpatti and abhāva (non-existence). Prabhākara does not accept the last as a pramāṇa.

The subjects of the twelve chapters of the PMS are stated in the J. N. M. V. to be respectively: (1st chapter) *pramāṇa* (means of knowledge; (2nd) *bheda* (six grounds on which religious rites are distinguished from each other and the distinctions of rites as principal and subsidiary); (3) Śeṣa (the meaning of śeṣa being 'ancillary or what subserves another that is called *śeṣin* or what is helpful to another'), how it is employed and the relative strength of śruti, liṅga, vākya, prakaraṇa, sthāna and samākhyā; (4) *prayukti* (what is obligatory and what is addressed to the performer's conscience i. e. what is *kratvartha* and what is *puruṣārtha*); (5) Krama (principles of settling the order or sequence depending on śruti &c.); (6) adhikāra (persons entitled to perform yāga); (7) sāmānyātideśa (extension of items in the model yāga to its modifications); (8) Viśeṣātideśa (extension of items to individual rites); (9) ūha (adaptation of mantras and saṁskāras); (10) bādha

---

1933. धर्मे प्रमीयमाणे हि वेदेन करणात्मना। इतिकर्तव्यताभागं मीमांसा पूरयिष्यति॥ बृहट्टीका (of कुमारिल) q. by तन्त्ररहस्य (G. O. S., 1956, p. 36). This verse is introduced with the following lucid remarks 'वेदवाक्यार्थसंशये सति तन्निर्णयोपयिकन्यायनिबन्धनं हि शास्त्रं मीमांसा। ...सा च करणीभूतस्य वेदस्येतिकर्तव्यता। यथा चक्षुष आलोकः। यथा वाऽनुमानस्य व्याप्तिस्मरणम्। यथा वोपमानस्य सादृश्यम्। यथा वा अर्थापत्तेः सन्देहापत्तिः।'.

(omitting certain items or details in modifications of model yāgas; (11) *tantra* (one item being useful and enough for several acts or persons); (12) *prasaṅga* (extension of application). In the four pādas of the first adhyāya four matters are respectively dealt with viz. vidhi (hortatory texts), arthavāda (laudatory or explanatory passages including mantras), smṛtis (including customs and usages) and names (of rites, such as *udbhid*, *citrā*). Śabara himself gives a summary [1934] of the first chapter of PMS as follows; viz. the pramāṇas; principles of the conclusions about vidhi, arthavāda, mantra and smṛtis, examination of guṇavidhi (texts laying down some subsidiary or accessory matter as in 'dadhnā juhoti', where curds are prescribed as offering) and nāmadheya; the determination of doubtful matters by the help of the remainder of a passage or by the *sāmarthya* (the suitability of things for the actions prescribed). It is unnecessary for the purpose of this section to furnish here a summary of the contents of the other chapters of the PMS. For a tolerably full summary of the contents of the twelve chapters of the PMS the reader is referred to the author's paper 'a brief sketch of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā system' in ABORI, vol. VI. pp. 6-12. At the beginning of each chapter Śabara summarizes what he dealt with in the preceding chapter and sets out the principal topics of that chapter.

The P. M. S. itself is of enormous extent and it has been overlaid with commentaries and with numerous commentaries on commentaries. Even before Śabara there was a commentator described as Vṛttikāra, [1935] who is mentioned in several places

---

1934. प्रथमेऽध्याये प्रमाणलक्षणं वृत्तम्। तत्र विध्यर्थवादमन्त्रस्मृतयस्तत्त्वतो निर्णीताः। गुणविधिर्नामधेयं परीक्षितम्। सन्दिग्धानामर्थानां वाक्यशेषादर्थाच्चाध्यवसानमुक्तम्। शबर at the beginning of II. 1. 1. The तन्त्रवार्तिक explains तत्त्वतः in the above as follows 'विध्यादितत्त्वनिर्णीतिः प्रमाणेनैव स्थिता। समस्तो हि प्रथमः पादश्चोदनासूत्रपरिकरः। ... श्रुतिमूलत्वं विज्ञानस्य स्मृतिप्रामाण्ये तत्त्वम्। नामधेयस्य चोदनान्तर्गतत्वात्प्रमाणत्वम्। सन्दिग्धनिर्णये वाक्यशेषसामर्थ्ययोः प्रामाण्यमित्येवं समस्तमध्यायं प्रमाणलक्षणमाचक्षते।'. As the P. M. S. is divided into twelve chapters it is called द्वादशलक्षणी.

1935. Śabara expressly mentions (Bhagavān) Upavarṣa (on I. 1. 5) as to what is 'śabda', while Rāmānuja says (note 1886 above) that Bodhāyana composed a bhāṣya on both P. M. S and V. S. There are controversies about Vṛttikāra, Upavarṣa and Bodhāyana. Vide M. M. Prof. Kuppuswami in Pro. of 3rd All India O. Con. pp. 465–468 and Pandit V. A. Ramaswami in I. H. Q. vol. X, pp. 431–433 for identity of Vṛttikāra and Upavarṣa, while Dr. S. K. Iyengar in 'Maṇimekalai in its historic setting' p. 189 and

(*Continued on next page*)

by Śabara (sometimes with great respect) viz. on II. 1. 32 and 33, II. 2. 26, II. 3. 16, III. 1. 6 ('atra bhagavān Vṛttikāraḥ'), VIII. 1. 1. ('vṛttikāraiḥ' in the plural), X. 4. 23. On P. M. S. I. 1. 3–5, II. 1, 33, VII. 2. 6 Śabara differs from Vṛttikāra. The earliest extant commentary on the P. M. S. is the bhāṣya of Śabara. Śabara quotes many verses concerning PMS matters and a few also on other topics. Verses quoted on PMS matters are found on II. 1. 32 (one on p. 434 and another on p. 435), II. 1. 33 (p. 436, two verses),[1936] II. 2 1 (p. 462, two verses on adṛṣṭārtha), on IV. 3. 3 (one verse on p. 1247), IV. 4. 21 (p. 1279 a verse on piṇḍapitṛyajña), IV. 4. 24 (p. 1280 an Āryā verse on the girdle of sacrificial post), IV. 4. 28 (p. 1281 about 'svaru'), V. 2. 23 (p. 1319, same verse on XII. 2. 30 p. 2251), VII. 1. 12 (p. 1534 definition of *atideśa*), X. 4. 20 (p. 1924 one verse), XI. 1. 1 (p. 2096 on *tantra* and *prasaṅga*), XII. 3. 20 (p. 2262 on bhāsika-svara). All these verses are apparently quoted by Śabara from some work or commentary on the PMS or on Pūrvamīmāṁsā, one or two probably from some Śrautasūtra and one or two may be his own composition.

Many glosses on PMS composed by writers of the 10th and following centuries are extant, of which 22 are referred to on p. 166 of vol. VI. of the Sarasvatībhavana Studies (Benares) by M. M. Gopinath Kaviraja in his paper on the 'Mīmāṁsā Mss. in the Government Sanskrit Library at Benares' (pp. 165–196). On Śabara's bhāṣya there were numerous commentaries as is

(*Continued on next page*)

the present author in JBBRAS for 1921 pp. 83–98 at p. 84, hold that Vṛttikāra and Upavarṣa are different. M. M. Kuppuswami Sastry (in Pro. of 3rd O. Conference pp. 465–468) holds Bodhāyana and Upavarṣa identical. Śaṅkarācārya twice names Upavarṣa with great respect (as bhagavān) on VS I. 3. 28 and III. 3. 53, but he nowhere mentions Bodhāyana to whose extensive commentary Rāmānuja refers at the beginning of his bhāṣya on VS. Vide J. I. H. Madras, vol. VII. pp. 107–115 on Bodhāyana and Upavarṣa and V. A. Ramaswami Sastry's Intro. to the Tattvabindu pp. 14–18 (1936). Vide I. H. Q. vol. X. pp. 431–452 on 'Vṛttikāras of Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtra.'

1936. It is remarkable that the two verses about the ten topics dealt with by Brāhmaṇas (on P. M. S. II. 1. 33) occur also in the Brahmāṇḍa purāṇa II. 33. 47–48. In शबर they are: हेतुर्निर्वचनं निन्दा प्रशंसा संशयो विधिः। परक्रिया पुराकल्पो व्यवधारणकल्पना॥ उपमानं दशैते तु विधयो ब्राह्मणस्य तु॥ एतत्स्यात् सर्ववेदेषु नियतं विधिलक्षणम्॥. There are a few variants in the ब्रह्माण्ड. The verse about विधिलक्षण on IV. 3. 3 is introduced with the words एवं हि पदवाक्यार्थन्यायविदः श्लोकमामनन्ति–कुर्यात्क्रियेत०.

clearly indicated by the Ślokavārtika that says that the very first sentence[1937] of Śabara's bhāsya was interpreted in six different ways before it by commentators and by the Tantravārtika that the bhāsyakāra did not notice six sūtras after the 'nivītādhikaraṇa' (III. 4. 1-9) and that commentators differed in their reasons for the omission, but all commentators other than Śabara did explain those six sūtras.[1938] None of the commentaries composed before Kumārila is now available.

.Kumārila wrote the Ślokavārtika on Śabara's bhāsya on P. M. S. I. 1 (in about 4000 verses) and the voluminous Tantravārtika on I. 2 to the end of chap. III of PMS and the Ṭup-ṭīkā on P. M. S. IV–XII (stray notes, not a regular commentary). Kumārila is credited with having composed two more commentaries, 'Madhyama-ṭīkā' and 'Bṛhat ṭīkā' on P. M S.[1939] The latter has been referred to by the Nyāyaratnākara[1940] and the Nyāyasudhā on Tantravārtika quotes several verses from it (on pp. 201, 329–30, 393) and the Jaiminīya-sūtrārthasangraha of Ṛsiputra Parameśvara quotes Bṛhat-ṭīkā several times. On the Ślokavārtika two commentaries have so far been published viz. the Nyāyaratnākara of Pārthasārathi and the Kāśikā of Sucaritamiśra (in T. S. S.). In the Introduction to his English translation of the Tantravārtika, M. M. Dr. Ganganath Jha notices eight commentaries on the Tantravārtika of which the Nyāyasudhā or Rāṇaka of Someśvara (published in Chowkhamba Series) is a very exhaustive one, the others being in Ms. The

---

1937. लोक इत्यादि भाष्यस्य षडर्थान्संप्रचक्षते। भाष्यकारानुसारेण प्रयुक्तस्यादितः पृथक्॥ श्लोकवा. (प्रतिज्ञासूत्र, verse 26)

1938. अतः परं षट् सूत्राणि भाष्यकारेण न लिखितानि तत्र व्याख्यातारो विवदन्ते। केचिदाहुर्विस्मृतानि। लिखितो ग्रन्थः प्रलीन इत्यपरे। फल्गुत्वादुपेक्षितानीत्यन्ये। अनार्षत्वादित्यपरे। ...वृत्त्यन्तरकारैस्तु सर्वैर्व्याख्यातानि। सन्ति च जैमिनेरेवंप्रकाराण्यप्यनत्यन्तसारभूतानि सूत्राणि। तन्त्रवा. after III. 4. 9 p. 895.

1939. Vide 'Kumārila and the Bṛhaṭ-ṭīkā' by K. S. Ramasvami Sastri and A. Sankaran in Pro. of 3rd All India O. Conf. pp. 523-529 where on p. 526 the Sarvadarśanakaumudī of Mādhava-bhāratī is quoted as cataloguing all the five works of Kumārila and *ibid*. p. 475 where Prof. Kuppuswami cites the same Sarvadarśanakaumudī.

1940. तामभावोत्थितामन्यामर्थापत्तिमुदाहरेत्। पक्षदोषेषु चान्यासामुदाहरणविस्तरः॥ श्लोकवा. (अर्थापत्तिपरिच्छेद v. 9), on which न्यायर. remarks "अर्थापत्त्यन्तराणामप्युदाहरणप्रपञ्चः पक्षदोषावसरे 'श्रोत्रादिनास्तितायामि'त्यादिना बृहट्टीकायां दर्शित इत्याह पक्षदोषेष्विति".

Ṭupṭīkā [1941] has some regular commentaries but none is published. The Tantraratna of Pārthasārathimiśra deals at some length with the same chapters of P. M. S. (published partly in Prince of Wales, Sarasvatībhavana S.). On Śabara's bhāṣya Prabhākara wrote a commentary called Bṛhatī, a portion of which on the Tarkapāda (PMS I. 1) with the commentary Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā of Śālikanāthamiśra has been edited by Pandit S. K. Ramanatha Sastri and published by the Madras University (1934). The Śāstra-dīpikā of Pārthasārathi is not a regular commentary on the P. M. S. but it is a classic work on the P. M. S. and follows the views of Kumārila. Another very useful work is the Jaiminīya-nyāya-mālā-vistāra [1912] of Mādhavācārya (published by Anan. Press, Poona) that gives summaries in verse of the *adhikaraṇas* of the PMS with brief prose comments and also points out some of the differences of Prabhākara (called 'guru' by Śālikanātha and others) from Kumārila (in all about 15 points of difference being noted between the two as regards the first chapter of the PMS and three in the 2nd chapter). Śālikanātha wrote an independent work called Prakaraṇapañcikā (published in the Chowkhamba S. S.). There is another work of Prabhākara's school called Nayaviveka of Bhavanātha or Bhavadeva (ed. by Pandit S. K. Ramanath Sastri and published by the Madras University in 1937). This Bhavanātha is eulogised in the Madanaratnapradīpa on Vyavahāra (pp. 324–325, published by the Anup S. Library, Bikaner, 1948) as the sun to the lotus of Prabhākara's doctrine. The Tantrarahasya of Rāmānujācārya (2nd ed. published in G O. S, 1956) composed about 1750 A. D. is the last noted work of the Prābhākara School and this work furnishes some useful information about the works of Prabhākara and the commentaries thereon by Śālikanātha. A verse in the Prabodhacandrodaya (Act II) after referring to Guru, Kumārila

---

1941. It is difficult to explain the name टुप्टीका. It is explained as an abridged form of अनुष्टुप्टीका or टुप् is an indeclinable in the sense of 'small' 'टुप् इत्यल्पार्थेऽव्ययम्.'

1942. The जै. न्या. मा. वि. verse 9 says: सर्वथापि सहस्रे द्वे नातिक्रामति संग्रहः, and it is remarked सर्वथापि सहस्रन्यायसंग्रहरूपो ग्रन्थः श्लोकसहस्रद्वयपूर्तेरर्वागेव समाप्स्यते न तु सहस्रद्वयमतिक्रामति'. This works puts down the number of अधिकरणs in पू. मी. सू. at 1000, while some other works say there are only 915 adhikaraṇas. The मीमांसासारसंग्रह of शङ्करभट्ट (pub. by Haridas Gupta at Benares in 1904) gives the summary of 1000 adhikaraṇas in 250 verses, the concluding verse being आचार्यैरधिकरणान्युक्तानि सहस्रसंख्यानि। तत्सिद्धान्तान्यार्वैस्तत्संख्यैर्भट्टशङ्करोऽवदत्॥'.

(or Tautātita), Sālikanātha and Vācaspati refers to Mahodadhi and Māhāvratī (work of Mahāvrata), the last two being mentioned in the Nayaviveka (pp 271, 273 respectively).

Prabhākara differed from Kumārila on numerous points.[1943] The divergence starts from the very first sūtra of the P. M. S. (as the note below will show[1944]). Prabhākara is called guru' by Śālikanātha in many places in the Prakaraṇapañcikā (vide first Intro. verse and pp. 17, 32 &c.). There is a very great divergence of views about the relative chronological position of Kumārila and Prabhākara. Vide 'the Prābhākara School' (1911) by M. M. Ganganath Jha, A. B. Keith's 'Karmamīmāṁsā' (1921) pp 9–11, Pro. of 2nd All India O. Conf. pp. 408–412 and Pro. of 3rd All I. O. Conference pp. 474–481 (both by Prof. Kuppuswami Sastri), J. O. R. Madras, vol. I pp. 131–144 and 203–210. The fundamental question is whether Śālikanātha was a direct pupil of Prabhākara or only a later follower. From several considerations the present writer holds that Śālikanātha was a direct pupil of Prabhākara. Śālikanātha not only speaks of Prabhākaraguru,

1943. Vide Journal of the Benares Hindu University, vol. II, pp. 309–335 for collection in Sanskrit of the points of difference between Prabhākara and Kumārila (called Bhaṭṭa), particularly pp. 331–335 for a table of the points of difference. Vide also Intro. to Tattvabindu by Pandit V. A. Ramasvami Sastri, 1936, pp. 37–40 for a few important points on which the two differ.

1944. According to the Bhāṭṭa school, the 'viṣayavākya' of PMS I. 1. 1 is स्वाध्यायोऽध्येतव्यः in शतपथ XI. 5. 6 3 and तै. आ. II. 15. 1 (एतस्मात्स्वाध्यायोऽध्येतव्यो यं यं क्रतुमधीते तेन तेनास्येष्टं भवतीति). According to the प्राभाकर school the viṣayavākya is अष्टवर्षं ब्राह्मणमुपनयीत तमध्यापयीत, the idea in this latter case being that study of Veda (Vedādhyayana) is only an aṅga (a subsidiary matter) of the *vidhi* to teach a student the Veda after his upanayana. The objections of the Prābhākara school against the viṣayavākya 'svādhyāyo'dhyetavyaḥ' are that it has a seen fruit or reward and that when a seen fruit can be found it is improper to suppose that there is an unseen reward. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p, 837 n. 1628 where several passages from Śabara and others are cited about this maxim. The एकादशीतत्त्व (pp. 88-89 on मन्त्र) after quoting P. M. S. III. 2. 1 winds up 'इति दृष्टार्थसम्पत्तौ नादृष्टमिह कल्प्यते इति'. I have not been able to find from what *Vedic* work the sentence 'अष्टवर्षं...पयीत' is taken. It seems that the view that this passage contains a vidhi about teaching the Veda is only an inference from passages like Manu II. 140, III. 2, and Gautama I. 10–11. The प्रकरणपञ्चिका (on p. 6) admits this: कः पुनराचार्यकरणविधिः, 'उपनीय ... प्रचक्षते' (मनु 2. 140) इति स्मरणानुमितः. According to this उपनयन is only an aṅga of the अध्यापनविधि. On p. 225 of the पञ्चपादिका of पद्मपाद (published with two commentaries in the Govt. Oriental Series, Madras, 1958) there is a scathing criticism of this विषयवाक्य (अष्टवर्षं ... पयीत).

but in one place states 'our teacher does not tolerate this'.[1945] Śālikanātha in his Prakaraṇapañcikā quotes several verses of the Ślokavārtika (e. g. on p. 5 he quotes and criticizes verse 11 of Ślokavārtika quoted in n. 1916 above, on p. 122 quotes Ślokavārtika v. 28 of abhāva-pariccheda and on p. 114 verse 21 of arthāpatti-pariccheda). Maṇḍanamiśra wrote several works on PM viz. Vidhi-viveka (published at Benares with Nyāyakaṇikā of Vācaspati), Bhāvanāviveka (with com. of Umbeka, edited in S. B. series), Vibhramaviveka and Mīmāṁsānukramaṇī (Chow. S. S.). The Śāstradīpikā (on PMS II. 1. 1) cites Maṇḍana's explanation of Kumārila's verse[1946]. Therefore, Maṇḍana is later than Kumārila or was a younger contemporary of Kumārila and flourished about 690 to 710 A. D. Śālikanātha quotes Vidhiviveka of Maṇḍana (pp. 243, 302) in Prakaraṇapañcikā p. 178 and Brahmasiddhi in Ṛjuvimalā (p. 20). Moreover, Śāntarakṣita in his Tattvasaṅgraha (GOS) frequently criticizes the kārikās of Kumārila (without naming him) and his pupil Kamalaśīla names Kumārila many times. Śāntarakṣita does not name or quote Prabhākara. He flourished between 705-762 A. D. (vide Foreword to Tattvasaṅgraha p XVI, GOS). Therefore, Kumārila must be placed about 650-700 A. D. As Śālikanātha quotes the Ślokavārtika and Maṇḍana's works he would have to be placed between 750-800 A. D. If Śālikanātha was a direct pupil of Prabhākara it follows that the latter (who appears to be unknown to Śāntarakṣita, should have been a contemporary (i. e. should be held to have flourished nearly between 700-760 A. D. or a little later) and was later than Kumārila. There is a tradition that Prabhākara was a pupil of Kumārila. Traditions (such as of

---

1945. यत्र बह्वीषु ज्वालास्वेकवर्तिवर्तिनीषु ज्वालात्वं सामान्यं प्रत्यभिज्ञागोचरः कैश्चिदिष्यते तदपि गुरुरस्माकं न मृष्यति। प्रकरण॰ p. 31. He would have said simply 'गुरुर्न मृष्यति' if he were a later follower and not a pupil.

1946. शास्त्रदीपिका on पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 2 (p. 101) says: उक्तं ह्येतदाचार्यैः। धात्वर्थव्यतिरेकेण ... गम्यते॥'. This is तन्त्रवार्तिक p. 382; then शास्त्रदीपिका proceeds: विवृतं चैतन्मण्डनेन 'कथ्यमानाद्रूप ... भावना किं प्रदुष्यति॥'. This is भावनाविवेक p. 80 (with slight variations). The भावनाविवेक on p. 61 quotes तथा क्रमव्रतोर्नित्यं ...प्रतीयते'. This occurs in तन्त्रवा. p. 381. The author regrets that M. M. Dr. Jha (*in Intro. to* 'Pūrvamīmāṁsā *in its sources*' *p. 21*) asserts, *on the very* slender basis of the above quoted words of the Śāstradīpikā, that Maṇḍana wrote a *commentary* on the Tantravārtika. M. M. Jha himself felt uneasy about his own sweeping assertion (p. 22 bottom), but he was not able to discover the verse of the Bhāvanāviveka referred to above.

the nine gems at the court of Vikramāditya) often arise without much evidence to support them; they should not, however, be summarily rejected but should be tested by other available evidence.

At one time Prabhākara appears to have occupied a very prominent position. The Gadag inscription of Vikramāditya VI (in 1098 A. D.) refers to the founding of a school for teaching Prabhākaras' system at Lakkiguṇḍi (vide E. I. vol. XV p. 348). This and the reference in the Mitākṣarā (on Yāj. II. 114) to the views of Guru on[1947] the Lipsāsūtra (PMS. IV. 1. 2.) in the third alternative interpretation put on that sūtra, holding that the rules about the acquisition of wealth (in Gautama and other smṛtis) are *puruṣārtha* (addressed to the conscience of the performer of sacrifices) and not *kratvartha*, show the outstanding position that the Prābhākara school occupied in the 11th century A. D. in the Carnatic and Maratha countries. The Madanapārijāta, a north Indian work (1360–1390 A. D.), quotes a half verse of Guru[1948] (on p. 89). The Smṛticandrikā (on Vyavahāra p. 257), the Vīramitrodaya (on vyavahāra p. 523) and the V. M. (p. 89) refer to the Nayaviveka of Bhavanātha, almost the last outstanding work of the Prābhākara school. Gradually, the Prābhākara School lost ground and the Bhāṭṭa school of Kumārila has been most predominant for several centuries. The present writer holds that Prabhākara is later then Kumārila but he is not in a position to say from whom he borrowed his peculiar views or whether they were started by him for the first time (though this appears more plausible). Pandit K. S. Ramaswami Sastri (in Intro. to Tantrarahasya, G. O. S., 2nd edition of 1956) holds that Prabhākara took his views from Bādari (p. XXV). The learned Pandit offers hardly any tangible evidence for his remark (on p. XIX of the Intro.) that Bādari held views similar

---

1947. नियतोपायकं स्वत्वं लोकसिद्धमेवेति न्यायविदो मन्यन्ते। तथा हि लिप्सासूत्रे तृतीये वर्णके द्रव्यार्जननियमानां क्रत्वर्थत्वे स्वत्वमेव न स्यात् स्वत्वस्यालौकिकत्वादिति पूर्वपक्षासम्भवमाशङ्क्य द्रव्यार्जनस्य प्रतिग्रहादिना स्वत्वसाधनत्वं लोकसिद्धमिति पूर्वपक्षः समर्थितो गुरुणा। ननु च द्रव्यार्जनस्य क्रत्वर्थत्वे स्वत्वमेव न भवतीति याग एव न संवर्तेत। प्रलपितमिदं केनापि अर्जनं स्वत्वं नापादयतीति विप्रतिषिद्धमिति वदता। तथा सिद्धान्तेपि स्वत्वस्य लौकिकत्वमङ्गीकृत्यैव विचारप्रयोजनमुक्तम् — 'अतो नियमातिक्रमः पुरुषस्य न क्रतोः' इति। मिता. on या. II. 114.

1948. न च निरपेक्षयोर्गुणयोर्मिथः सम्बन्धः। गुणानां च परार्थत्वादसम्बन्धः समत्वात्स्यात् — इति सूत्रकारवचनात्। कर्तुश्च शेषत्वमुपादिष्टं गुरुणा। अधिकारो हि यज्ञेषु कर्तुः शेषस्य विधीयते। इति। मदनपारिजात p. 89. 'गुणानां... स्यात्' is पू. मी. सू. III. 1. 22.

to those of Bhartṛmitra who so interpreted the PMS as to make it atheistic. Bādari's views on Mīmāṁsā matters are quoted only *four times* in PMS viz. in III. 1. 3 (on what matters are *śeṣa*), VI. 1. 27 (that vedic sacrifices can be performed even by śūdras), VIII. 3. 6. (purely sacrificial matter about application of Ṣaḍaha procedure), IX. 3. 33. (about method of singing *sāman*, Bādari's view being accepted by Jaimini). In none of these does one find the slightest touch of Bhartṛmitra's atheistic tendencies or of Prabhākara's special propositions.

From Kumārila onwards there are numerous commentaries, commentaries on commentaries and manuals on some aspects of mīmāṁsā doctrines or of the contents of the PMS. Several difficult questions of identity and relationship among some of the early writers whose works are wholly or partially extant have also arisen during the last fifty years and many papers have been written. The present writer has read most of them, but if the whole evidence is to be set out and discussed a bulky volume of several hundred pages would have to be written. That cannot be done here. The several questions of identity and relationship are set out below and the present author's replies to all of them will be given with a little discussion on a few out of them:

(1) Whether Prabhākara was a pupil of Kumārila; the reply is that there is no substantial or compelling evidence for this except tradition, but Prabhākara is certainly later than Kumārila;

(2) Whether Śālikanātha is a direct disciple of Prabhākara —yes;

(3) Whether Maṇḍana was a disciple of Kumārila; there is no substantial evidence for an affirmative reply, but Maṇḍana certainly explains in his Bhāvanāviveka a verse of Kumārila and quotes another verse from Tantravārtika. Vide note 1946 above. In the Vidhiviveka also (Benares ed. 1907), which Maṇḍana wrote after Bhāvanāviveka he quotes (on p. 15 'abhidhābhāvanā...liṅādayaḥ) from Tantravārtika (p. 378) and on p. 315 of the Vidhiviveka quotes (yathoktam-śreyaḥsādhanatā... ...pratīyate') from Ślokavārtika (codanāsūtra, verse 14). Maṇḍana also quotes a passage from the Bṛhatī (p. 38) of Prabhākara in Vidhiviveka[1949] (p. 109). So Maṇḍana, if not a disciple, was

1949. उक्तं च-कर्तव्यताविषयो नियोगो न नियोगः कर्तव्यतामाह । विधिविवेक p. 109, on which the न्यायकणिका of वाचस्पति remarks 'अत्रैव जरत्प्राभाकरोक्तीतार्थे गुरोर्वचः सङ्गच्छते'. This sentence occurs in बृहती p. 38 (तर्कपाद. pub. by Madras Un., 1934).

certainly later than or a younger contemporary of Kumārila.

(4) Are Maṇḍana and Umbeka identical—no; Umbeka wrote a commentary on the Bhāvanāviveka of Maṇḍana in which on pp. 17 and 76 he discusses various readings in it; it is not possible to hold that a writer would discuss variant readings in his own work (as would follow if the two were identical).

(5) Are Maṇḍana and Viśvarūpa identical—No;

(6) Are Viśvarūpa and Sureśvara identical—yes; the latter name being assumed after Viśvarūpa became a *sannyāsin.*

(7) Is Umbeka identical with Bhavabhūti—the evidence is not enough to give a definite affirmative reply; but it is likely that they may be identical.

(8) Is Umbeka a disciple of Kumārila—yes; as shown in note below.[1950]

1950. That Umbeka was a pupil of Kumārila follows from the following considerations. In his com. on the Bhāvanāviveka (p 43) Umbeka quotes a half verse from Bhaṭṭapāda (यथोक्तं भट्टपादैः। अन्यदेव हि धात्वर्थसामान्यं करणात्मकम्) and on the same page he quotes another half verse 'यथोक्तं गुरुणा-अन्यश्च भावना नाम साध्यत्वेन व्यवस्थितम्'. These two halves make one verse on p. 383 of the Tantravārtika, the latter half of which is again ascribed by Umbeka (on p. 92 of his com. on the same work) to Bhaṭṭapāda. It follows that Bhaṭṭapāda was his guru. Prof. Kunhan Raja tries to wriggle out by advancing the theory (on pp. XXXVII-XXXVIII of his Intro.) that some later scribe inserted the word 'guruṇā' and argues that there is no proof of Bhaṭṭapāda being Umbeka's guru. Unless another reliable ms. of Umbeka's commentary is found which omits the word 'guruṇā' or substitutes in its place some other word it is not open to us to hold that the reading is not trustworthy and then build positive or negative propositions on our own speculations alone. The Uveyaka whose view is quoted by Kamalaśīla in Tattvasaṅgraha (G. O. S p 812 'उवेयकस्त्वाह न बोधात्मकं नाम ज्ञानानां प्रामाण्यं, किं तर्हि, अर्थाविसंवादित्वम्') is probably उम्बेक, whose name is written in several different ways in works and mss. (vide M. M. Jha's Intro. to Bhāvanāviveka p. 2). If this identity is correct उम्बेक must have flourished before 750 A. D and chronology would not be against Umbeka being a pupil of Kumārila. The Yukti-snehaprapūraṇī on Śāstradīpikā quotes Umbekabhaṭṭa in several places. But one long quotation from Umbeka on p. 30 is very striking. In this both Śabara and Vārtikakāra (i e Kumārila) are severely criticized and after quoting the famous verse frequently cited in the Mahābhārata गुरोरप्यवलिप्तस्य ... परित्यागो विधीयते he discards the views of the Vārtikakāra. Śabara is separated from Umbeka by several centuries and was not Umbeka's guru. Therefore, this passage (that occurs on pp. 105-108 of the तात्पर्यटीका of Umbeka on Ślokavārtika, pub. by Madras Un. in 1940) leads to the inference that the Vārtikakāra was

(*Continued on next page*)

(9) Is Sureśvara, a pupil of Śaṅkarācārya ?—Yes.

The result of the above replies is that the following is the most probable chronological order of Pūrvamīmāṁsā writers mentioned in questions 1 to 9 viz. Kumārila, Prabhākara, Maṇḍana, Umbeka, Śālikanātha. They flourished between 650 A. D. to 750 A. D., Kumārila being the earliest of the five, Prabhākara (who quotes Kirātārjunīya II. 30 twice on pp. 242, 343) and Maṇḍana being contemporaries or Maṇḍana being younger than Prabhākara.

The opening and ending verses in Sureśvara's Vārtika on the bhāṣya of Śaṅkara on the Bṛ. Up. and the Tai. Up. leave no room for doubt that he was a disciple of Śaṅkara.

From the present author's paper in JBBRAS for 1928, pp. 289–293 and Prof. Kuppuswami's paper on 'Maṇḍana, Sureśvara equation in the History of Vedānta' in ABORI vol. 18 pp. 121–157 it follows that Maṇḍana and Sureśvara are not identical.

Some remarks in the learned Introduction of Prof. Kunhan Raja to the edition of Umbeka's Com. on the Ślokavārtika invite criticism. Prof. Raja (on p. XLIX) states that his attempt has been only to raise doubts and to attempt at weighing the evidence for and against various theories. The present writer has no serious objection to this. But he thinks that Prof. Raja has gone wrong in his interpretation of words like 'anupāsitaguravaś-codayanti' (p. 33) and 'anupāsitaguruprajñā-vilasitam-iti'[1951] grantha-jñāna-mānino manyante' (p. 30). He starts (XLII) by saying "whether it meant (i. e. 'anupāsitaguru' meant) one by

(*Continued from last page*)

Umbeka's guru. The युक्तिस्नेहप्रपूरणी writes 'अत्रोम्बेकभट्टैरिदं तु वार्तिककारीयं दूषणं समर्थनं सर्वमेवालूनविशीर्णमित्यादिना श्येनादौ न कस्यचिदनर्थत्वम्... तस्यानर्थप्रतिपादनपरं श्येनो वज्र इत्यादि भाष्यमुपेक्षणीयम्। गुरोरप्य ... विधीयते इत्यनेन ग्रन्थेन वार्तिकं भाष्यं च दूषितम्।. It is quite clear that at least the युक्तिस्नेहप्रपूरणी holds that the वार्तिक view is discarded by उम्बेक. The words इदं वार्तिककारीयं दूषणं... विशीर्णम् occur on p. 105 (at end) of the तात्पर्यटीका; the words श्येनो वज्र इषु° occur in Śābarabhāṣya on p. 18 (Ānan. ed.). The verse गुरोरप्यवलिप्तस्य occurs on p. 108 of तात्पर्यटीका.

1951. The words are to be dissolved as अनुपासितः गुरुः येन (or यैः if अनुपासितगुरवः occurs) तस्य (or तेषां) मज्ञा तस्याः विकसितम्, उपासितः गुरुर्येन (कुमारिलेन) तस्य भावः उपा...गुरुता (in the Introductory remarks in Tātparyaṭīkā to Ślokavārtika verse 2). In this last the word 'guru' is meant for Kumārila's guru (or gurus) to whom he makes obeisance in the 2nd verse, while with regard to the objector, who is ridiculed, guru is meant to refer to Kumārila.

whom the teacher was not respected or a teacher who was not respected (by his disciples)' and then proceeds 'but the expression 'upāsitagurutām' (appearing in the commentary on the 2nd verse of the Ślokavārtika) settles the point. It must mean 'one by whom the teacher was not respected'. 'Upāsita-guru' literally means 'one who waited on the guru i. e. listened to the explanations of his teacher and made them his own'. 'Honoured' is at most a secondary meaning of 'upāsita'. Upa-ās literally means 'sit near, wait upon'. I fail to see how it settles the point. The word 'upāsita-gurutām' (when introducing the 2nd intro. verse of the Ślokavārtika) is applied by Umbeka to Kumārila himself in relation to the Ślokavārtika verse 'abhivandya gurūnādau'. It means 'the characteristic or quality of one who has served his teacher i. e. who has carefully listened to what the guru expounded and understood it.' The expression 'anupāsitaguru' (which, according to Prof. Raja, always refers to Prabhākara) frequently (vide also pp. 14, 52, 75, 291, 441) used by Umbeka means 'he or those who have not waited upon the guru and listened to his words carefully and therefore have failed to grasp the correct meaning of the passages'. The inference suggested by these words of derision is that the objector (either Prabhākara or some one else) has not understood the doctrine taught by Kumārila to him and the present author is disposed to hold that the frequent emphasis on the word 'guru' in 'anupāsitaguru' is a veiled reference to Prabhākara-guru (as Śālikanātha puts his name in his Prakaraṇa-pañcikā 'Prabhākara-guror-dṛṣṭyā), who was Kumārila's pupil but deviated from his guru's doctrines and wrote against them and Umbeka attacks and derides him for this. Supposing that Prabhākara had once been a pupil of Kumārila and later on propounded views that very much diverged from Kumārila's, it is natural if Umbeka took up the cudgels on behalf of Kumārila and attacked Prabhākara as one who had forsaken his Guru's views, had not digested them properly and had written a work (not now available but well-known to Umbeka) severely attacking Kumārila. Prof. Raja (Intro. pp. XLIII and XLIV) throws out the suggestion that on p. 14 and p. 291 Umbeka possibly suggests that Prabhākara preceded Kumārila. There is nothing of the kind. Umbeka holds that Prabhākara had not grasped his master's doctrines and tries to show what the real doctrine misunderstood by Prabhākara was.

It appears desirable to set out a tentative chronological table of the outstanding works and writers of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā, with

a few remarks here and there. Most of the dates are approximate and tentative.

Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtra of Jaimini—400 B. C. to 200 B. C.

Vṛttikāra—There is great conflict of views about the person who the Vṛttikāra quoted several times by Śabara was. Pārthasārathi in Śāstradīpikā p. 48 (first line) holds that he is Upavarṣa. Vṛttikāra is cited with great respect by Śabara, but he also differs from him frequently. The Prapañcahṛdaya (p. 39) attributes to Bodhāyana an extensive commentary called Kṛtakoṭī on both mīmāṁsās. It is remarkable that Bodhāyana is not mentioned by name by any early work on P. M. S. nor does Śaṅkara mention him though he twice mentions Upavarṣa. Rāmānujācārya in the opening words of his bhāṣya on Brahmasūtra refers to the extensive commentary of Bodhāyana on the Brahmasūtra. But he does not say that Bodhāyana commented on P. M. S. The present author is not even now prepared to hold that Vṛttikāra mentioned by Śabara so often is identical with Upavarṣa. Śabara cites at some length the different interpretation of PMS I. 1. 3–5 by Vṛttikāra and in the midst of it mentions (on p. 45) by name the view of Upavarṣa on 'what is śabda'. He appears to regard the two as different. The fact that the Tantravārtika (pp. 602–3 on II. 3. 16) appears to identify Upavarṣa with Vṛttikāra is not conclusive. From Kumārila himself we know that several Vṛttis were written on PMS before as well as after Śabara. So even Upavarṣa may have been deemed to be Vṛttikāra by Kumārila (on II. 3. 16) and his views quoted, though the Vṛttikāra in other places in Śabara's bhāṣya may be different.

Upavarṣa—between 100 B. C. to 100 A. D.

Bhavadāsa—The Ślokavārtika (Pratijñāsūtra, v. 63) mentions him by name and verse 33 of the same as explained by the Nyāyaratnākara shows that Bhavadāsa was deemed to be earlier than Śabara by the Ślokavārtika; between 100–200 A. D.

Śabara—between 200–400 A. D. (nearer the former date). From the Tantravārtika on II. 3. 23 p. 612, on II. 3. 27 p. 620 and III. 4. 31 p. 967 it appears that there was another person called Bhāṣyakārāntara, who was earlier than Śabara. From Tantravārtika on III. 4. 12 (p. 909) and Ṭup-ṭīkā on VI. 5. 10 (p. 1462) it seems that Kumārila sometimes applies the word vṛttikāra to Śabara also.

Bhartṛmitra—On verse 10 of the Ślokavārtika, the N. R says that the former refers to Bhartṛmitra who so interpreted the Mīmāṁsā as to make it atheistic. According to Umbeka (in Tātparyaṭīkā p. 3) his work was called Tattvaśuddhi; between 400–600 A. D.

Kumārilabhaṭṭa—About 650–700 A. D.[1952]

Prabhākara—author of Bṛhatī on Śabara's bhāṣya—between 675–725 A. D.

Maṇḍana—Disciple of Kumārila or a younger contemporary, wrote on both P. M. and Vedānta; in Vidhiviveka p. 109 he quotes the Bṛhatī (vide Pro. of 3rd O. Conf. p 479); his other works are Bhāvanāviveka, Vibhramaviveka and Mīmāṁsānukramaṇikā; between 680–720 A. D. Vide ABORI vol. 18 pp. 121–157 (by Prof. Kuppuswami Sastri), J. I. H. vol. XV pp. 320–329.

Umbeka—pupil of Kumārila and commentator of Ślokavārtika and of Maṇḍana's Bhāvanāviveka; generally identified with dramatist Bhavabhūti between 700–750 A. D.

Śālikanātha—pupil of Prabhākara and author of the commentary Ṛjuvimalā on Prabhākara's Bṛhatī and of an independent work 'Prakaraṇa-pañcikā'. It is noteworthy that in Ṛjuvimalā on Bṛhatī (p. 91) he quotes a verse from Ślokavārtika (Vākyādhikaraṇa verses 43–44) and refers to Kumārila with great respect as 'Yadāhur-Vārtikakāra-miśrāḥ'; 710–770 A. D.

Sureśvara—(called Viśvarūpa before he became a saṁnyāsin) disciple of Śaṅkarācārya. Between 800–840 A. D.

1952. One circumstance which fixes the earliest limit of Kumārila's time is furnished by the Kāśikā (com. on Aṣṭādhyāyī). In the lengthy pūrvapakṣa against Grammar contained in the Tantravārtika on P. M. S. I. 3. 24 (from p. 254 onwards), on p. 260 an objection is raised that Pāṇini himself violates his own rules laid down in 'tṛjakābhyām kartari' (Pāṇ. II. 2. 15) in the sūtras 'Janikartuḥ prakṛtiḥ' (Pāṇ. I. 4. 30) and 'tatprayojako hetuśca' (Pāṇ. I. 4. 55). The Kāśikā of Jayāditya and Vāmana defends the sūtra 'tatprayojako hetuśca' in the words 'तस्य प्रयोजकः तत्प्रयोजकः, निपातनात्समासः' (p. 91 of Benares ed.). The पूर्वपक्षि in तन्त्रवार्तिक on p. 260 does not accept this explanation of the Kāśikā in the words: न चैषां निपातनैः साधुत्वसिद्धिः। कुतः। येषामनुगमो नास्ति ते सिध्येयुर्निपातनैः। अन्यथानुगतानां तु प्रयोगं बाधते स्मृतिः। स्मृत्याचारविरोधे हि स्मृतिरेव बलीयसी। प्रत्यक्षप्रतिषेधाच्च जनिकर्मात्वसाधुता।'. From I-tsing's remarks it appears that Jayāditya died in or about 661 A. D. Therefore the Tantravārtika in which fault is found with Kāśikā's explanation must be later than about 650 A. D.

Vācaspati-miśra — wrote famous works on all śāstras; author of Nyāyakaṇikā on Maṇḍana's Vidhiviveka and Bhāmatī on Śaṅkarabhāṣya; between 820–900 A. D.

Pārthasārathimiśra — author of Śāstradīpikā (pub. by Nirn. Press 1915), Nyāyaratnākara (com. on Ślokavārtika), Tantraratna (com. on Ṭupṭikā) and Nyāyaratnamālā (pub. in G. O. S. with com. Nāyakaratna of Rāmānujācārya); between 900–1100 A. D.

Authors later than Pārthasārathi are placed below in one paragraph.

Sucaritamiśra — author of com. called Kāśikā on the Ślokavārtika (a part published in the T. S. S.); Bhavanātha (or Bhavadeva), author of the Nayaviveka, pub. in Madras Uni. Sanskrit series, with the com. Vivekatattva of Ravideva (on Tarkapāda, 1937), between 1050–1150 A. D; Someśvara — son of Mādhava, author of the Nyāyasudhā or Rāṇaka (a voluminous commentary on the Tantravārtika), pub. in Chowkhamba S. S. at Benares, 1909, about 1200 A. D; Murārimiśra — who is supposed to have founded a third school of Mīmāṁsā (Murārestṛtīyaḥ panthāḥ), author of Tripādīnītinayana (part pub. in J. O. R. Madras, vol. II pp. 270–273 and vol. V. pp. 1–5) and Aṅgatvanirukti, Ānan. ed. pp. 1141–1190), between 1150–1220 (acc. to Intro. to Tattavabindu); Mādhavācārya, author of Jaiminīya-nyāyamālāvistāra (pub. by Ānan. Press); vide H. of Dh. Vol. I. pp. 374–381), between 1297–1386; Appayyadīkṣita, author of Vidhirasāyana (pub. at Benares), is deemed to have written 100 or 108 works on different śāstras, said to have flourished between 1520–1593 A.D., another view being that he flourished between 1554–1626 A. D.; Laugākṣibhāskara, author of Arthasaṅgraha (text with translation, pub. by Dr. Thibaut in 1882 and by several others); Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa, author of Mīmāṁsā-bālaprakāśa (Benares), between 1550–1620 A. D.; Āpadeva, son of Anantadeva, author of Mīmāṁsā-nyāyaprakāśa (pub. by B. O. R. I. Poona, with a lucid commentary by M. M. Vasudevasastri Abhyankar, 1937); there are several other editions of this work, one of which edited by Prof. Edgerton with transliterated text, translation and notes in Harvard O. Series is very useful; between 1610–1680 A. D.

Khaṇḍadeva, author of Bhāṭṭakaustubha with Bhāṭṭadīpikā (published in Mysore Govt. Oriental series), and Bhāṭṭarahasya. About 1600–1665 A. D.

Gāgābhaṭṭa or Viśvesvarabhaṭṭa, son of Dinakarabhaṭṭa, author of Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi (part published at Benares); between 162?–1690 A. D.

Rāmānujācārya, author of Tantrarahasya (G. O. S.), belonging to the Prābhākara school and of Nāyakaratna (com. on Nyāyaratnamālā of Pārthasārathi, G. O. S., 1956); about 1500–1575 A. D.

Mīmāṁsākośa (in Sanskrit)—An encyclopaedic and most learned work on Pūrvamīmāṁsā—prepared by Swami Kevalānanda Sarasvatī, published by the Prājñapāṭhaśālāmaṇḍala at Wai in the Satara District, Bombay State; four parts have been published so far, covering over 2400 pages and four more are to be published. The press copy of the whole is, it is understood, ready. Unfortunately the great Swami entered *Brāhmī state* five years ago.

Some of the works written in English on the P. M. S., apart from short papers and the translation of the Śābarabhāṣya (3 vol. in G. O. S.), the Tantravārtika and the Ślokavārtika of Kumārila (Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1900) by M. M. Dr. Ganganath Jha, may be noted here for those who desire to make further studies in P. M. S. The following works and papers are also useful.

Max Müller's 'Six systems of Indian Philosophy' in collected works (ed. of 1899), pp. 197–214; The Prābhākara school of Pūrvamīmāṁsā by M. M. Ganganath Jha (1911); Karmamīmāṁsā by A. B. Keith (1921); 'Indian Philosophy' by Prof. Das-Gupta, vol. I. pp 367–405 (Cambridge, 1922); 'A Brief Sketch of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā system' by the present author in A. B. O. R. I. vol. VI pp. 1-40 (1925); 'Outlines of Indian Philosophy' by Prof. M. Hiriyanna, pp. 298–325 (Allen and Unwin, London, 1932); Introduction on 'a short History of the Pūrva-mīmāṁsā-śāstra' to the edition of the Tattvabindu of Vācaspatimiśra by Pandit V. A. Ramaswami Sastri (Annamalai University S. Series, 1936); 'Indian Philosophy' by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, vol. II. pp 374–429 (1941); Introduction (pp. III–LI) to the edition of the Tātparyaṭīkā of Umbeka on Ślokavārtika by Prof. C. Kunhan Raja (Madras Un. 1940); 'Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its sources' by M. M. Ganganath Jha (Benares Hindu University, 1949) with a critical Bibliography (pp. 5–81) by Dr. Umesha Mishra; 'Citations in Śabarabhāṣya' by Dr. D. V. Garge (Poona, 1952), a painstaking work

in which the learned writer has been able to identify many of the quotations in Śabara's bhāṣya that had eluded such a deep scholar as M. M. Ganganath Jha, though even Dr. Garge has not been able to identify a large number; *Introduction to the* Tantrarahasya of Rāmānujācārya by Pandit K. S. Rāmaswami Sastri (G. O. S. 1956); Mīmāṇsā — the Vākyaśāstra of Ancient India, by Prof. G. V. Devasthali (Book-sellers' Publishing Company, Girgaon Back Road, 1959); Mīmāṁsā Jurisprudence by Shrī Nataraja Aiyyar, Allahabad (Jha Research Institute).

CHAPTER XXIX

Some Fundamental Doctrines of Pūrvamīmāṁsā

Some of the characteristic fundamental doctrines of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā will now be set out with some references and a few remarks as to some of them, the views of Prabhākara and his followers being also rarely referred to.

(1) Veda is eternal, self-existent, not composed by any author, human or divine, and is infallible. This is the core of the P. M. system. Vide P. M. S. I. 1. 27–32 and Śabara on I. 1. 5 (p. 53) and Ślokavārtika (Vākyādhikaraṇa, verses[1953] 366–368). The argument briefly is; Veda is learnt at present and was studied in the past also by students from teachers, that there is no evidence about the person who first composed it or who first studied it. If it be argued that such a reasoning may be put forward as regards the Mahābhārata, the reply is that people know that Vyāsa is the author of it. Similarly, the passages in Smṛtis and Purāṇas that Prajāpati created the Veda are merely arthavādas (laudatory) not based on any evidence or perception and are meant only to convey the absolute authoritativeness of the Veda. If the connection between word and sense is eternal and not brought about by any person, the same reasoning holds good as to the Veda. This view is opposed to the view of the Naiyāyikas who hold that God is the author of the Veda or the interpretation of V. S. I. 1. 3 (Śāstrayonitvāt) by Śaṅkarācārya based on Bṛ. Up. II. 4. 10. Manu I. 21 (stating that Brahmā created from the words of the Veda the names and appropriate duties of all) seems to suggest that (according to

---

1953. On P. M. S. I. 1. 5 Śabara comments (pp. 52–53) 'तस्मान्मन्यामहे केनापि पुरुषेण शब्दानामर्थैः सह सम्बन्धं कृत्वा संव्यवहर्तुं वेदाः प्रणीता इति। तदिदानीमुच्यते। अपौरुषेयत्वात्सम्बन्धस्य सिद्धमिति। कथं पुनरिदमवगम्यतेऽपौरुषेय एष सम्बन्ध इति। पुरुषस्य सम्बन्धुरभावात्। कथं सम्बन्धो नास्ति। प्रत्यक्षस्य प्रमाणस्याभावात् तत्पूर्वकत्वाच्चेतरेषाम्।'; वेदस्याध्ययनं सर्वं गुर्वध्ययनपूर्वकम्। वेदाध्ययनवाच्यत्वादधुनाध्ययनं यथा॥ भारतेऽपि भवेदेवं कर्तृस्मृत्या तु बाध्यते। वेदेऽपि तत्स्मृतिर्या तु सार्थवादनिबन्धना॥ पारम्पर्येण कर्तारं नाध्येतारं स्मरन्ति हि। श्लोकवार्तिकवाक्याधिकरण verses 366–368; the प्रकरणपञ्चिका (p. 140), remarks 'कथं पुनरपौरुषेयत्वं वेदानाम्। पुरुषस्य कर्तुरस्मरणात्। ... काठकादिसमाख्यापि न कर्तृसद्भावमुपकल्पयितुमलम्। प्रवचनेनापि तदुपपत्तेः।'. The argument when put in a syllogistic form would run like this: 'वेदाः अपौरुषेयाः, अस्मर्यमाणकर्तृकत्वात्। यन्नैवं तन्नैवं यथा महाभारतरघुवंशादि।'. शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. I.3.29 (अत एव च नित्यत्वम्) begins his भाष्य with the words 'स्वतन्त्रस्य कर्तुरस्मरणादिभिः स्थिते वेदस्य नित्यत्वे.'

Manu) the Veda was self-existent. Similarly, the Mahābhāṣya on Vārtika 3 on Pāṇini IV. 3. 101 ('tena proktam') remarks[1954] that the Vedas were not composed by anyone, that they are eternal, that the meaning of the Veda is eternal, but the arrangement of the letters is not eternal and therefore we have different vedic texts like Kāṭhaka, Kālāpaka, Paippalādaka &c. The Smṛtis also sometimes state that there is no author of the Veda, that Brahmā remembers it and that Manu also has remembrance of Dharma in different Kalpas (Parāśarasmṛti I. 21).

In P. M. S. I. 1. 28 ('Anityadarśanāc-ca') the opponent of the eternality of the Veda puts forward such passages as 'Babara Prāvāhaṇi (son of Pravāhaṇa) desired' (Tai. S. VII. 1. 10. 2) and 'Kusuruvinda Auddālaki desired' (Tai. S. VII. 2. 2. 1), which mention men named Prāvāhaṇi and Auddālaki (son of Uddālaka) that are mortals and argues that Veda did not exist before those mortals and is, therefore, not eternal. To this the Siddhānta replies in P. M. S. I. 1. 31 ('param tu śrutisāmānyam') that such examples are to be explained differently viz, 'Babara' is a onomatopoetic word meaning 'rustling' and Prāvāhaṇi (from 'pra' and 'vāhay' causal of *vah*) means the wind.

It may be noted that centuries before Jaimini and Yāska there was a school of Vedic interpreters called 'Aitihāsikas'. For example, Ṛg. X. 98. 5 and 7 refer to Devāpi, son of Ṛṣṭiṣeṇa, and to Śantanu. Yāska (in Nirukta II. 10), starting with the words 'tatra-itihāsamācakṣate' states that Devāpi and Śantanu were brothers of the Kuru family and the younger brother Śantanu was crowned king ignoring the rights of the elder and that these verses refer to them. In Ṛg. X. 10 there is a dialogue between Yama and Yamī and Nir. V. 2 refers to the 8th verse of it. Those who hold that Veda is eternal would explain Yama as Āditya and Yamī as 'Night'. Ṛg. III. 33 is a dialogue between the sage Viśvāmitra and the rivers. The Nir. (II. 25-27) explains verses 5-6 and 10 of that hymn from the Aitihāsika point of view and states that Viśvāmitra was son of king Kuśika and does not mention the Nairukta interpretation of these verses.

1954. ननु चोक्तं न हि छन्दांसि क्रियन्ते नित्यानि छन्दांसीति। यद्यप्यर्थो नित्यो या त्वसौ वर्णानुपूर्वी सा नित्या। तद्भेदाच्चैतद्भवति काठकं कालापकं मौदकं पैप्पलादकमिति। महाभाष्य on वार्तिक 3 on 'अधिकृत्य कृते ग्रन्थे' पा. IV. 3. 87. पाणिनि emphasizes this distinction between being the author of a work and being only the expounder or transmitter in the two sūtras 'तेन प्रोक्तम्' (IV. 3. 101) and 'कृते ग्रन्थे' (IV. 3. 116). The पूर्वमीमांसासूत्र I. 3. 30 'आख्या प्रवचनात्' also emphasizes the difference between कृत and प्रोक्त.

About the Aśvins the Nirukta (XII. 1) states several views viz. they are Heaven and Earth, or Day and Night, or the Sun and the Moon and remarks that according to the Aitihāsikas they were kings who had accumulated great merit. Probably the Nairuktas were divided among themselves and explained that the Aśvins represented different natural phenomena. About Vṛtra (occurring in such verses as Ṛg. I. 32. 11) the Nairuktas (Etymologists) said in Nirukta II. 16 that the word means 'cloud', while the Aitihāsikas say that he (Vṛtra) was an Asura, son of Tvaṣṭṛ. As to the hymn Ṛg. I. 105 of 19 verses (in the first 18 of which the refrain is 'vittam me asya rodasī') the Nirukta IV. 6 states that the hymn was seen by Trita who was thrown into a well. In Ṛg. VII. 33. 11 there is mention of Urvaśī and Vasiṣṭha (Maitrā-Varuṇa) as born of Urvaśī and Nirukta (V. 13–14) explains that verse and remarks that Urvaśī was an *apsaras* and Ṛg. X. 95 is a dialogue between Aila Purūravas and Urvaśī. But the interpretation of the Nairuktas and Aitihāsikas on this story are not expressly set out. Probably the Nairuktas would explain Urvaśī as lightning and Purūravas as the roaring wind. The hymn Ṛg. X. 108 is a dialogue between Saramā (Indra's bitch) and the Paṇis and the Nirukta XI. 25 explains the first verse and remarks that there is a story (Ākhyāna) therein viz. that there was a dialogue between Saramā sent by Indra and the Paṇis who were Asuras. In all such legends the Nairuktas would insist that they are to be taken allegorically as referring to natural phenomena, while the Aitihāsikas would insist that there is historical basis in all these. Though it is not stated by the Nirukta expressly that the Aitihāsikas do not hold the doctrine of the eternality of the Veda it implicitly follows from their explanations that they did not subscribe to that doctrine.

2. The connection between word and sense is eternal.[1955] This is explained by the words of Śabara (in n. 1953) that there is no person who could be put forward as having brought about

---

1955. The sūtra (P. M. S. I. 1. 5) contains several conclusions. The first is औत्पत्तिकः (नित्यः) शब्दस्य अर्थेन सम्बन्धः, the 2nd is तस्य ज्ञानमुपदेशः (exhortation is the means of knowing it i. e. dharma); here ज्ञान means ज्ञायते येन (श्लोकवा. औत्पत्तिकसूत्र verse 9); the next part is अव्यतिरेकश्चार्थेऽनुपलब्धे (it is unfailing or infallible as to all that is not perceptible); तत्प्रमाणमनपेक्षत्वात् i e Vedic injunction is a valid means of knowledge since it is independent; बादरायणस्य (this is the view of Bādarāyaṇa also). The question 'what is a

(*Continued on next page*)

the connection of word and sense. Vide P. M. S. I. 1. 6–23, Śabara's bhāṣya thereon, the elaborate treatment in 444 verses in Ślokavārtika (pp. 728–8'5) and Prakaraṇa-pañcikā pp. 133–140 (seventh Prakaraṇa). On the question "what does a word like 'Gauḥ' denote," the P. M. S. replies that a word denotes 'ākṛti' (or jāti) i. e. the universal, the class. Briefly, the Mīmāṁsakas hold that the word, the denotation and the relation of these two are eternal. Vide P. M. S. I. 3. 30–35.

3. *The individual soul.* The P. M. S. does not expressly affirm the existence of the soul in any sūtra. Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. III. 3. 53 refers to this fact, states that Śabara, the Bhāṣyakāra, propounded the existence of the soul and that the venerable Upavarṣa refrained from going into that question in his exposition of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā with the remark that he would expound it when dealing with Śārīraka (i. e. the Vedānta-sūtra). It was probably due to this fact of the absence of a statement about the soul that the Pūrvamīmāṁsā was interpreted by some as favouring atheism. Kumārila complains that the Mīmāṁsā, though not really atheistic, was put forward as Lokāyata (atheistic)[1956] by some and that therefore he endeavours (in the

---

(Continued from last page)

word' is answered differently by different writers. The revered Upavarṣa said that in a word like 'gauḥ' it is the letters that constitute the word (vide Śabara quoting Upavarṣa p. 45 on I. 1.5 and Śaṅkara on V. S. I. 3. 28). The other view is that the letters manifest the sphoṭa and it is the sphoṭa that conveys the sense. This subject cannot be dealt with in this work.

1956. प्रायेणैव हि मीमांसा लोके लोकायतीकृता। तामास्तिकपथे कर्तुमयं यत्नः कृतो मया॥ श्लोकवा. verse 10. The न्या. र. notes that भर्तृमित्र put forward several wrong doctrines about the Mīmāṁsā such as the one that the performance *of obligatory acts or of prohibited acts leads to no desirable or undesirable* results. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 46–47 note 57 and vol. II. pp. 358–359 on लौकायतिक and नास्तिक. The meaning of लोकायत had changed from time to time. कौटिल्य (I. 2) included लोकायत under आन्वीक्षिकी along with सांख्ययोग. पाणिनि appears to have known the word लोकायत, his sūtra (IV. 2. 60) is 'क्रतूक्थादिसूत्रान्ताट्ठक्' and लोकायत is the 2nd word in the उक्थादिगण; the Kāśikā on this sūtra mentions लौकायतिकः; at least before the 6th century A. D. लौकायतिक had come to be identified with one who did not believe in the existence of a soul independent of the body. The कादम्बरी (paragraph 153) has 'लौकायतिकविद्ययेवाधर्मरुचेः'. शङ्कराचार्य on वेदान्तसूत्र III. 3.54 says that the Lokāyatikas do not admit any principle other than the four elements (earth, water, heat and wind) and do not believe in the existence of a soul apart from the body. Vide Prof. Das-gupta's 'Indian Philosophy' vol. III. p. 512–533 and 'Lokāyata' by Dr. W. Ruben (Berlin 1954). From the Chān. Up. VIII. 8 it appears that Asura Virocana held that there was no soul

(Continued on next page)

Ślokavārtika) to show that it treads the path of belief (in soul and another world). The souls are many, eternal, all-pervading (omnipresent) and different from the body, the senses and the mind. The soul resides in the body, is the agent (*kartṛ*) as well as *bhoktṛ* (enjoyer), is of the nature of pure consciousness, and is cognised by itself (svasaṁvedya). Though the P. M. S. does not expressly deal with the existence of the soul, there are indications that the P. M. S. itself must have impliedly accepted the existence of the soul. The reward of many religious rites is *Svarga* and the P. M. S. refers to numerous Vedic passages where svarga is the reward of rites and assumes that the reward goes to the performer (e. g. in the *adhikaraṇa* III. 7. 18–20 beginning with 'Śāstraphalam prayoktari' that expounds the meaning of such vedic passages as 'agnihotram juhuyāt svargakāmaḥ'). Śabara on I. 1. 5 expounds at great length the existence of the soul as different from the body, senses &c. (vide particularly pp. 60–72 of Ānan. ed.). The Ślokavārtika devotes 148 verses to this subject and the Tantravārtika also briefly deals with it on P. M. S. II. 1. 5 (pp. 402–403). The Ślokavāritka (Ātmavāda, verse 148) has this interesting verse[1957] 'the Bhāṣyakāra (Śabara) desirous of refuting atheism has established here (i. e. in bhāṣya passages) by reasoning the existence of the soul; the

(*Continued from last page*)

apart from the body and that the body alone was the soul. There is a recent book published (while these pages were being sent to the press) viz. 'Lokāyata' (study of ancient Indian materialism) written by Shri. Devaprasad Chattopadhyaya (New Delhi, 1959), which deals with the subject of Indian materialism in detail.

1957. इत्याह नास्तिक्यनिराकरिष्णुरात्मास्तितां भाष्यकृदत्र युक्त्या। दृढत्वमेतद्विषयस्य बोधः प्रयाति वेदान्तनिषेवणेन॥ श्लोकवा. (आत्मवाद) 148. About the soul being स्वसंवेद्य, शबर says स्वसंवेद्यः स भवति, नासावन्येन शक्यते द्रष्टुं कथमसौ निर्दिश्येतेति। यथा च कश्चिच्चक्षुष्मान् स्वयं रूपं पश्यति न च शक्नोत्यन्यस्मै जात्यन्धाय तन्निदर्शयितुम्। न च तस्य शक्यते निदर्शयितुमित्येतावता नास्तीत्यवगम्यते' and relies upon certain passages of the Bṛ. Up. such as III. 9.26, IV. 5 15 (अगृह्यो न हि गृह्यते), IV. 3.6 (आत्मैवास्य ज्योतिर्भवति). As the words आत्मास्तिता and नास्तिक्य are put in juxtaposition in श्लोकवार्तिक it follows that, acc. to कुमारिल, a नास्तिक is primarily one who does not believe in the existence of the soul. पाणिनि has the sūtra 'अस्ति नास्ति दिष्टं मतिः' IV. 4. 60 on which the महाभाष्य explains 'अस्तीत्यस्य मतिरास्तिकः। नास्तीत्यस्य मतिर्नास्तिकः'; the काशिका explains 'परलोकोऽस्तीति यस्य मतिरस्ति स आस्तिकः तद्विपरीतो नास्तिकः'; so नास्तिक primarily means 'one who does not believe in the existence of the soul (and as a consequence in a world other than the physical). The तन्त्रवा. (pp. 402–404 on II. 1, 5) establishes the following propositions about the soul: तत्र नित्यः सचात्मा शरीराभ्यन्तरवर्ती (नाणुमात्रः, न शरीरपरिमितः), सर्वगतः, आत्मनामात्वे स्वदोषः, सर्वगतस्यापि सिद्धमात्मनो निश्चलत्वम्।.

knowledge on this subject (viz. existence of the soul) becomes sound and enduring by the study of Vedānta passages'. The Padma-purāṇa states that Jaimini composed a vast, but useless Śāstra by expounding the view of there being no god.[1957a]

4. *God and the devatās in sacrifices.* Śabara's position is that the Vedas were not created by God, nor was the connection between word and sense created by Him. The Prakaraṇapañcikā also (pp. 137 ff) denies a creator for the whole universe. Kumārila's position [1958] also is peculiar and startling. He says in the Ślokavārtika that it is difficult to prove that God first created the world together with Dharma and Adharma and the means of attaining these, words, senses, and their relations and the Veda. Thus it appears that he does not expressly deny the existence of a supreme power or God but simpily ignores such power or God. In spite of this he begins his Ślokavārtika with an obeisance to Śiva.[1959] The Nyāyaratnākara says that the verse can also be an apotheosis of Yajña. But in that case Kumārila would have to be charged with duplicity. It is better to say that the tradition of beginning a work with a *maṅgala* verse could not be discarded even by Kumārila.

The consideration of the question of what is meant by the *devatā* with reference to which an offering is cast into the sacred fire leads to startling results. Jaimini (in VIII. 1. 32-34) takes the position that in a sacrifice the *havis* (offering) is the principal matter while the *devatā* is a subordinate one (*guṇa*) and that if there be a conflict between the havis and the devatā, the final conclusion is to be arrived at by relying on the havis. The reasoning is that the Veda connects the deity with the sacrificial act, as in 'one desirous of progeny should offer an havis for Indra and Agni cooked on eleven potsherds and then Indra confers on him progeny' (Tai. S. II. 2. 1. 1.). Even though

---

1957a. वेदार्थवन्महाशास्त्रं मायया यदवैदिकम्। मयैव रक्ष्यते देवि जगतां नाशकारणात्। द्विजन्मना जैमिनिना पूर्वं वेद (चेद?)मपार्थकम्। निरीश्वरेण वादेन कृतं शास्त्रं महत्तरम्॥ पद्मपुराण VI, 263. 74-76.

1958. यदि त्वादौ जगत्स्रष्टा धर्माधर्मौससाधनौ। यथा शब्दार्थसम्बन्धान् वेदान् कश्चित्प्रवर्तयेत्॥ जगद्धिताय वेधस्य तथा किंचिन्न दुष्यति। सर्वज्ञवत्तु दुःसाधमित्यत्रैतच्च संश्रितम्॥ यदा सर्वमिदं नासीत् कावस्था तत्र गम्यताम्। प्रजापतेः क्व वा स्थानं किं रूपं च प्रतीयताम्॥ श्लोकवा. (सम्बन्धाक्षेप॰ verses 43-45.

1959. विशुद्धज्ञानदेहाय त्रिवेदीदिव्यचक्षुषे। श्रेयःप्राप्तिनिमित्ताय नमः सोमार्धधारिणे॥ first verse. The न्या. र. remarks 'सोमस्य अर्धं स्थानं ग्रहचमसादि तद्धारिणे इति यज्ञपक्षेपि सङ्गच्छते।'. मनु says: मङ्गलाचारयुक्तानां ... विनिपातो न विद्यते॥ IV. 146.

it is so, the *phala* (the reward) is conferred by the sacrifice and not by the deities (Indra and Agni in this case) and the words 'Indra[1960] and Agni confer progeny on the sacrificer' are purely laudatory. P. M. S. IX. 1. 6–10 are very important in this connection. Śabara quotes Vedic passages like Ṛg. X. 47. 1, III. 30. 5, VIII. 17. 8 (where Indra's right hand, fist, neck, stomach and arms are mentioned), Ṛg. I. 95 10, VIII. 77. 4 (where Indra is said to have put in his stomach all foods and to have drunk thirty vessels full of soma), Ṛg. VIII. 32. 22 and X. 89. 10 where Indra is said to be lord of the world, of heaven and earth, waters and mountains and then remarks that these are all *arthavādas*, though at first sight they appear to postulate that Vedic deities have bodies, eat and drink. The Śāstradīpikā advances the argument that if the devatā had a body, ate, drank and was pleased, devatā will be *anitya* (ephemeral) and could not in that case be treated of in the Veda that is eternal. He further asserts that men of limited intelligence not knowing the real import of the Vedic passages may hold wrong opinions. Śabara notes (on X. 4. 23) that there are various opinions as to who the Devatās are to whom either a hymn (*sūkta*) is addressed (as Ṛg. I. 94) or to whom 'havis' is directed by the Veda to be offered as in 'one should offer to Agni an offering cooked on eight potsherds'; that the devatā becomes connected with the sacrifice not in its own nature but by the word used with reference to an offering and that where the Veda directs an offering to be made to Agni, one cannot use a synonym for Agni such as 'Śuci, Pāvaka, Dhūmaketu, Kṛśānu, Vaiśvānara or Śāṇḍilya. Thus Devatā is a matter of words, as admitted by [1961]

1960. Note the following sūtras: विप्रतिपत्तौ हविषा नियम्येत कर्मणस्तदुपाख्यत्वात्। VIII. 1. 32; अपि वा शब्दपूर्वत्वात् यज्ञकर्म प्रधानं स्याद्गुणत्वे देवताश्रुतिः। IX. 1. 9. शबर's words on VIII. 1.34 are quite frank and clear: स्यादेतदेवं यदि देवतातः फलं स्यात्। यागात्तु फलं स्वर्गकामो यजेतेति श्रूयते। यत्तु 'तृप्त एवैनमिन्द्र' इति तत्रैवमुच्यते गुणत्वेन देवताश्रुतिः। यागे गुणभूता देवता। तस्या दातृत्वं स्तुत्या उच्यते। यथा अमात्येन मे ग्रामो दत्तः, यथा सेनापतिना मे ग्रामो दत्त इति। न चामात्यः सेनापतिर्वा ग्रामस्य प्रभवति। राजैव प्रभवति। इतरस्मिन् गुणभूते स्तुत्या दातृत्ववादः।'. गुणभूत means 'that has become a subordinate factor' as opposed to प्रधान.

1961. तस्मान्मन्त्रत्वे विधिशब्द उपादातव्य इति। उच्यते। नन्वेवं शब्द एव देवता प्राप्नोति। अत्रोच्यते। नैतदस्माभिः परिहर्तव्यम्। न हीदमुच्यमानमस्मत्पक्षं बाधते। शबर on X. 4. 23; यागादीनां देवताराधनहेतुत्वे प्रमाणाभावात्। ... अतो देवतोद्देशेन द्रव्यत्यागो याग इति गौणं देवतापूजात्मकत्वमवगमयितव्यम्। प्रकरणपञ्चिका pp. 185–186; यद्यपि देवता विग्रहवती परिगृह्य भुक्त्वा तृप्यति प्रसीदति च तथापि यागादेव फलं विग्रहवत्त्वे चानित्या स्यात्। शास्त्रदीपिका p. 580 on PMS IX. 1. 6–10.

Śabara. The Prakaraṇapañcikā also states that there is no proof that a sacrifice (yāga) is a means of pleasing the deity and that to say that there is worship of a deity in a *yāga* is really metaphorical. From this and the preceding doctrine (No. 1) it follows that P. M. S., Śabara, and Kumārila discard the idea that the Veda is the word of God or that rewards of religious acts are due to the favour or grace of God. It is therefore that the Padmapurāṇa quoted (in note 1957a) above dubs Jaimini's doctrine 'nirīśvaravāda' (Godless).

When the Veda says 'one desirous of heaven should perform a sacrifice', three *ākāṅkṣās* (expectancies) arise. The first is 'what is to be brought about'; this is satisfied by the word *svarga*, stating the reward or the purpose. The 2nd is 'by what means' is the first to be brought about. That is satisfied by the meaning of the root '*yaj*' (i. e. by yāga); the third is 'what is the procedure or in what manner'; that is satisfied by the establishment of the sacred fires and other rites that are described in the context of the passage 'svargakāmo yajeta'. It is learnt from this passage that the reward or purpose (svarga) springs from (is brought about by) yāga and not by the devatā.[1962]

Later writers could not digest all these ideas about the deities in sacrifices. Veṅkaṭanātha (or Veṅkaṭadeśika, 1269–1369 A. D.) composed a work called 'Seśvaramīmāṁsā', in which he criticizes both Bhāṭṭa and Prābhākara schools and being an ardent Vaiṣṇava of the Rāmānuja school attempts a synthesis of the two mīmāṁsās and brings in the idea of God as the dispenser of the reward of sacrifices against the combined testimony of Śabara, Kumārila, Śālikanātha and others. Vide Dr. Radhakrisnan in 'Indian Philosophy,' vol. II pp. 424–429 for 'God and world according to Pūrvamīmāṁsā'.

5. There is no real creation nor dissolution of the whole universe. The constituent parts may come and go but the universe as a whole has no beginning and no end. The descriptions of creation and dissolution are only meant to illustrate the power of *daiva* (fate, destiny) and the vanity of human effort and urge men to perform duties enjoined by the Veda. Without any human effort the world may come into being and in spite of

1962. यजेतेत्येवमादयः साकाङ्क्षा यजेत किं केन कथमिति, स्वर्गकाम इत्यनेन प्रयोजनेन निराकाङ्क्षाः । शबर on II.1.1. Vide टुप्टीका on IX 1. 9 अपि वा...देवताश्रुतिः quoted in note 1960.

all effort it may come to an end. The world is real and has always been there and will go on for all time.[1963] Vide Ślokavārtika (V. 112-117), Prakaraṇapañcikā pp. 137-140 and Nyāyaratnākara on the former. The Ślokavāratika goes so far as to say 'it must be admitted that all these (worlds &c.) existed before the creator, and again such a creator may be proved (by anumāna) to have been preceded by the Veda on account of his being an intelligent being, just as ourselves are preceded by the Veda.'

It would be noticed that the Mīmāṁsa idea of creation and dissolution is opposed to the Mahābhārata and Gītā (X. 8 'ahaṁ sarvasya prabhavo mattaḥ sarvam pravartate).

6. The doctrine of *apūrva* (invisible mysterious or subtle potency). The Veda lays down that one desirous of heaven should perform a sacrifice. But the reward heaven comes off only after a long time, while the sacrifice lasts only for a short time. There would thus be no direct connection between the sacrifice (the cause) and heaven (the reward) or purpose. It must be presumed from the Vedic injunction that there is some connecting link between the activity of man to perform a yāga and the reward. Before the principal and subordinate acts in a sacrifice are performed men have no capacity for svarga and sacrifices (described in the texts) are also incapable of producing the effect 'svarga'. The principal and subsidiary acts in a sacrifice when carried out remove the incapacity and produce a certain capacity or potency for svarga. This must be admitted by all. Unless such a capacity exists there would be the unacceptable conclusion that not doing the acts and doing them are on the same level. This capacity or potency either residing in the man (agent) or arising from the sacrifice that is performed is called *apūrva* in this śāstra. It is true that this capacity cannot be proved by direct perception or other means of knowledge except by *śrutārthāpatti*. When we are told that a man

---

1963. तस्मादद्यवदेवात्र सर्गप्रलयकल्पना। समस्तक्षयजन्मभ्यां न सिध्यत्यप्रमाणिका॥ सर्वज्ञवन्निषेध्या च स्रष्टुः सद्भावकल्पना॥... तस्मात् प्रागपि सर्वेऽमी स्रष्टुरासन् पदादयः। स्यात्तत्पूर्वकता चास्य चैतन्यादस्मदादिवत्॥ एवं ये युक्तिभिः प्राहुस्तेषां दुर्लभमुत्तरम्। अन्वेष्यो व्यवहारोयमनादिर्वेदवादिभिः॥ श्लोकवा. (सम्बन्धाक्षेप॰ verses 113-117). बुद्ध was called सर्वज्ञ, as the अमरकोश states 'सर्वज्ञः सुगतो बुद्धो' &c The न्या. र. remarks on verses 113-114 'यथा च बुद्धादेः सर्वज्ञत्वं पुरुषत्वादस्मदादिवन्निषिद्धम्, एवं प्रजापतेरपि स्रष्टृत्वं निषेध्यमित्याह सर्वज्ञवदिति। तेन दैवप्रभावकथनार्थोयं सृष्टिप्रलयवादः। समस्तपुरुषकाराभावेऽपि सृष्टिकाले दैववशेनैव सर्वं प्रवर्तते, प्रलयकाले च सत्यपि पुरुषकारे दैवोपरमादेवोपरमति तस्माद्धर्मानुष्ठान एव यतितव्यमित्येतत्परं सृष्टिप्रलयवचनमिति। न्या. र. on श्लोकवा. (सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरि॰ verse 112).

who is fat does not eat by day we presume, in order to account for this, that he must be eating food at night. Similarly, the Veda brings sacrifice and svarga together; we have to presume that sacrifice gives rise to a subtle potency, though the sacrifice itself comes to an end in a short time, and that this potency is the cause of bringing about the reward svarga and that we may look upon it as abiding in the soul of the sacrificer or as an invisible effect (a reaching forth of the yāga itself that has vanished).[1964] Mīmāṁsakas do not admit that the results of religious acts are given by God. The V. S. III. 2. 40 states that this is the view of Jaimini (dharmam Jaiminir-ata eva) and is opposed to the view of Bādarāyaṇa, Śaṅkara and the Bhāmatī that it is God who confers the reward. According to the Prakaraṇapañcikā (p. 186) the invisible force or potency is not in the agent but arises as a subtle *form from* the action itself. Four kinds of Apūrva[1965] (with further sub-divisions) as regards Darśapūrṇamāsa sacrifice are stated by Mādhavācārya.

The idea is that every rite as a whole produces an apūrva, and that each subordinate part (aṅga) of the rite has also an (apūrva) which is subordinate to the apūrva of the whole rite.

The Tantravārtika explains why it is called apūrva. The invisible potency was not in existence before the performance of

---

1964. चोदना पुनरारम्भः । पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 5; चोदनेत्यपूर्वं ब्रूमः । अपूर्वं पुनरस्ति यत आरम्भः शिष्यते स्वर्गकामो यजेतेति । इतरथा हि विधानमनर्थकं स्याद्भङ्गित्वाद्यागस्य । यद्यन्यदनुत्पाद्य यागो विनश्येत् फलमसति निमित्ते न स्यात् । तस्मादुत्पादयतीति । शबर; फलाय विहितं कर्म क्षणिकं चिरभाविने । तत्सिद्धिर्नान्यथेत्येवमपूर्वं प्रति गम्यते ॥ वेदवाक्योपात्तस्वर्गयागादिसम्बन्धानुपपत्त्या चोदनयैवापूर्वमपि चोदितं भविष्यतीति प्रमाणवत् । तस्मादस्त्यपूर्वमिति । तन्त्रवार्तिक p. 390; प्रधानकर्मणामङ्गकर्मणां वा प्राक्करणात्स्वर्गादिभाव्ययोग्याः पुरुषाः क्रतवश्च स्वर्गकार्यायोग्याः । तामुभयीमप्ययोग्यतां व्युदस्य प्रधानैरङ्गैश्च योग्यतोपजन्यत इत्यवश्यं सर्वेणाभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । असत्यां तस्यामकृतसमत्वप्रसङ्गात् । सैव च पुरुषगता क्रतुगता वा योग्यता शास्त्रेऽस्मिन्नपूर्वमित्युपदिश्यते । यत्तु प्रत्यक्षादिगम्यत्वमस्य नास्तीति सत्यं, श्रुतार्थापत्तिव्यतिरिक्तैर्न गम्यते स त्वदोषः । तन्त्रवा० p. 394; in the श्लोकवा. (अर्थापत्ति०) Kumārila says 'पीनो दिवा न भुङ्क्ते चेत्येवमादिवचःश्रुतौ । रात्रिभोजनविज्ञानं श्रुतार्थापत्तिरिष्यते ॥ v. 51. तन्त्रवा० further proceeds 'एवं स्वर्गादयोऽप्यङ्कुरादिस्थानीयां तावदपूर्वावस्थां प्रतिपद्यन्ते तया चोत्पद्यमानया त एवोत्पन्ना भवन्तीति'. तस्मादस्त्यपूर्वम् । सूत्रस्यापि च न प्रकृतोपयिकमन्यमर्थं पश्यामः । तेनारम्भचोदनैवापूर्वस्यापि चोदनेत्ययमेवार्थः । तन्त्रवा. p. 400. शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. III. 2. 40 puts briefly and clearly Jaimini's view 'श्रुतिश्चेत् प्रमाणं यथायं कर्मफलसम्बन्धः श्रुत उपपद्यते तथा कल्पयितव्यः । न चानुत्पाद्य किमप्यपूर्वं कर्म विनश्यत्कालान्तरितं फलं दातुं शक्नोति । अतः कर्मणो वा सूक्ष्मा काचिदुत्तरावस्था फलस्य वा पूर्वावस्थाऽपूर्वं नामास्तीति तर्क्यते ।; vide भामती on वे. सू. III. 2. 41.

1965. तच्चापूर्वं दर्शपूर्णमासयोरनेकविधम् । फलापूर्वं, समुदायापूर्वं, उत्पत्त्यपूर्वं, अङ्गापूर्वं चेति । येन स्वर्ग आरभ्यते तत्फलापूर्वम् । This is जै. न्या. मा. वि. This फलापूर्व is also called परमापूर्व.

the sacrifice and arises as something new after its performance and hence apūrva has a purely etymological sense.[1966]

If one holds the view that apūrva is some potency coming to reside in the performer of a sacrifice one's views would be like those of some modern writers who hold that real prayer is not mere repetition of certain words deemed to be sacred, but it is an upward movement or a real increase in the intensity of spiritual power in the man who prays, it being immaterial to ask to whom he prays (vide W. James' 'Varieties of religious experience' p. 467).

7. *Svataḥ-prāmāṇya* (self-validity of cognition). It has already been stated that the *pramāṇas* are six (five according to Prabhākara). The P. M. system postulates that all cognitions as cognitions are intrinsically valid in themselves, do not require any extraneous help to establish their validity but invalidity of cognitions is (*parataḥ*) established extraneously by showing that there was defect in the organ that produced the cognition or it is established later on that a particular cognition was wrong.[1967] Prabhākara goes much further and holds that every experience as such is valid and no experience can be said to be wrong or illusory.

8. *Svarga*. The ideas about heaven entertained by Jaimini, Śabara and Kumārila are different from the description of heaven in the Veda and Purāṇas. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp.

1966. यागादिजनितं च पुंसां फलप्राप्तिसामर्थ्यमपूर्वशब्दवाच्यं यागानुष्ठानात्पूर्वमभूतमनुष्ठानोत्तरकालं चापूर्वं जायत इति यौगिकत्वादेवापूर्वशब्दाभिधानं सर्वत्र लभ्यते। तन्त्रवा. p 299 on I. 3, 30; on पू. मी. सू. VII. 4. 1 शबर says 'इदमपि चोक्तं यजिरपूर्वं साधयति ततश्चापूर्वात्कालान्तरे फलं भवतीति चोदना पुनरारम्भ इत्यत्र।'.

1967. सर्वं विज्ञानविषयमिदं तावत्प्रतीक्ष्यताम्। प्रमाणत्वाप्रमाणत्वे स्वतः किं परतोऽथवा॥ स्वतः सर्वप्रमाणानां प्रामाण्यमिति गम्यताम्। न हि स्वतोऽसती शक्तिः कर्तुमन्येन शक्यते॥ ...... तस्माद्बोधात्मकत्वेन प्राप्ता बुद्धेः प्रमाणता। अर्थान्यथात्वहेतूत्थदोषज्ञानादपोद्यते॥ श्लोकवा० (चोदनासूत्र) verses 33, 47, 53; the last two verses are respectively quoted by शान्तरक्षित and कमलशील in तत्त्वसंग्रह pp. 745 and 788. On verse 33 the न्या. र. comments 'तदिहैव चिन्ता। किं ज्ञानस्य प्रामाण्यमप्रामाण्यं च स्वत एव निर्णीयते। किं वोभयमपि कारणगुणदोषादिना निरूपयितव्यम्, उताप्रामाण्यं स्वतः प्रामाण्यं परतो विपरीतं वेति।.' Here four possible views are put forward about प्रामाण्य and अप्रामाण्य. The मीमांसक view is that cognition is स्वतःप्रमाण, while its invalidity has to be established by other means (अप्रामाण्यं परतः). शबर on I. 1. 5 says 'तस्माद्यस्य च दुष्टं करणं यत्र च मिथ्येति प्रत्ययः स एवासमीचीनः प्रत्ययो नान्य इति।'; 'यत्र प्रयत्नेनान्विष्यमाणोऽपि कारणदोषो बाधकज्ञानं वा नोपलभ्यते तद् प्रमाणम्, इतरदप्रमाणम्' शास्त्रदीपिका on I. 1. 5 p. 50 (of Nirn. ed. of 1915).

165–167 and 168–171 for descriptions of the joys of heaven in the Vedic literature, the Epic and the Purāṇas. From considerations of space the remarks will have to be brief. In Ṛg. IX. 113. 7–11 the sage prays to Soma to place him in that immortal world where there is continuous light, where all desires are fulfilled, where there are joys of various grades. Heaven was deemed to be the place where the souls of valiant men that fought battles and sacrificed their lives went (Ṛg. VI. 46. 12) and in Ṛg. X. 154. 2–4 the soul of the dead is asked to join those departed men that had become invincible by great *tapas*, that had died in battle, that had made gifts of a thousand cows, that had led a life of right and virtue and that were wise sages.

The Atharvaveda IV. 34. 2 and 5–6 say that in heaven there are many women, they get edible plants and flowers of various kinds, there are streams of ghee, honey and wine (*surā*), milk, curds and there are lotus ponds all round. The Śatapatha Br. (XIV. 7. 1. 32–33) states that the joys of heaven are 100 times greater than those on earth. Vide Macdonnell's 'Vedic Mythology' pp. 167–168 and A. B. Keith's 'Religion and philosophy of the Veda' etc. pp. 403–406 (1924). Even the Upaniṣads refer to the joys of heaven e. g. Chān. VIII. 5. 3. speaks of two lakes in the world of Brahmā, aśvattha tree showering down Soma and the city of Brahmā calld Aparājitā; the Kauṣītaki Up. (I. 3 and 4) elaborates this and adds that five hundred Apsarases go out to meet him (who reaches heaven), one hundred with garlands in their hands, one hundred with ointments, one hundred with perfumes, one hundred with garments and one hundred with fruits. Poets like Kālidāsa love to dwell upon the instantaneous arrival of the soul of the warrior whose head was cut off in battle and who was at once joined by an apsaras in heaven (vide Raghuvaṁśa VII. 51 'Vāmāṅgasaṁsaktasurāṅganaḥ svam nṛtyat-kabandham samare dadarśa'). The Purāṇas furnish graphic descriptions of the joys of heaven. Vide Brahmapurāṇa 225. 6, Padma II. 95. 2–5, Mārkaṇḍeya 10. 93–95, which enumerate Nandana garden, aerial cars with bevies of Apsarases, golden beds and seats, absence of sorrows, all pleasure &c. Śabara on P. M. S. VI. 1. 1 refers to two popular views about *svarga*; one is, whatever gives pleasure to a person such as silken garments of fine texture, sandalwood, damsels sixteen years old is designated *svarga*. Another popular view is that *svarga* is a certain place where there is no heat nor cold, no hunger nor thirst, no dissatisfaction, no tiredness.

Śabara and Kumārila say that popular[1968] ideas about *svarga* are invalid, that the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas, being composed by men, need not be considered and that the Vedic descriptions of svarga are mere arthavādas for praise.

P. M. S. IV. 3. 15. provides that svarga[1969] is the reward of all religious acts (such as Viśvajit) for which no express reward is provided by the texts. Śabara states 'happiness is svarga and all seek that'; an old verse says 'that state of happiness in which there is no mixing of pain, which is not immediately overwhelmed by pain, that comes to one when one desires it, is called by the word *svar* (svarga)'.

Medhātithi remarks that smṛtis sometimes state[1970] that the gift of a single cow yields all rewards and relieves from sins with the result that fruits of great religious acts and of slight ones would be deemed to be the same but it should be understood that the rewards differ in their duration; otherwise, no one would engage in great or difficult rites.

Some Vedic rites expressly declare fruits of sacrifices that are other than svarga. For example, the Tai. S. provides 'one desirous of (plenty of) cattle should offer the *citrā* sacrifice' (II. 4. 6. 1.) or 'one desirous of (leadership or control over) a village should offer the Iṣṭi called Sāṅgrahaṇī' (Tai. S. II. 3. 9. 2.).

1968. ननु च लोकादाख्यानेभ्यो वेदाच्चावगम्यते देश एवंजातीयकः स्वर्ग इति। तन्न। पुरुषाणामेवंविधेन देशेनासम्बन्धादप्रमाणं वचः। आख्यानमपि पुरुषप्रणीतत्वादनादरणीयम्। वैदिकमपि स्वर्गाख्यानं विधिपरं नास्त्येव भवति तु विध्यन्तरेणैकवाक्यभूतं स्तुतिपरम्। शबर on VI. 1. 1 p. 1348.

1969. स स्वर्गः स्यात्सर्वान्प्रत्यविशिष्टत्वात्। पू. मी. सू. IV. 3. 15; शबर says 'सर्वे हि पुरुषाः स्वर्गकामाः कुत एतत्। प्रीतिर्हि स्वर्गः सर्वश्च प्रीतिं प्रार्थयते।'. स्वर्ग is the साध्य and याग is साधन acc. to टुप्टीका on P.M.S. VI. 2.4; यन्न दुःखेन सम्भिन्नं न च ग्रस्तमनन्तरम्। अभिलाषोपनीतं च तत्सुखं स्वःपदास्पदम्॥ q. by सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी of वाचस्पति p. 45 (Chow. edition) and by नीलकण्ठ on उद्योगपर्व 33. 72. Some quote this verse as from the विष्णुपुराण. The प्रकरणपञ्चिका (pp. 102–3) appears to echo the words of the verse 'ज्योतिष्टोमेन स्वर्गकामो यजेतेत्येवमादि समाम्नायं सकलदुःखसम्भेदरहिताभिलाषोपनीतदीर्घतरसुखसाधनत्वेनार्थवादैः स्तूयमानं कर्म दृश्यते।...तथा च यावत्तावत्सुखसाधने स्वर्गशब्दं न प्रयुञ्जते किन्तु सातिशयप्रीतिजनके।; मेधा० on मनु IV. 87 where narakas are said to be 21 remarks 'नरकशब्दो निरतिशयदुःखवचनः। एकविंशतिसंख्या अर्थवादः।. The printed विष्णुपुराण II. 6. 46 is; मनःप्रीतिकरः स्वर्गो नरकस्तद्विपर्ययः। नरकस्वर्गसंज्ञे वै पुण्यपापे द्विजोत्तम ॥.

1970. स्मृत्यन्तरे सर्वफलता पापप्रमोचनार्थतापि गोदानस्य श्रुता यावतामल्पोपकाराणां महोपकारैः फलसाम्यमुच्यते तेषां लोकवत्परिमाणतः फलविशेषोऽवगन्तव्यः। प्राप्यते तदेव फलं न तु चिरकालम्। आवाप्यो ह्ययं न्यायः। पणलभ्यं हि सस्याज्ञः क्रीणाति दशभिः पलैः—इति समानफलत्वे महाप्रयासानर्थक्यं प्राप्नोति। मेधा० on मनु III. 95.

Śabara says the Veda does not say that the result of such sacrifices cannot be had in this very life. This the Ṭupṭīkā[1971] expands in an interesting note. The remedy declared by the Veda for securing desired objects (son's birth and the like) is bound to yield the result in this life or in the next. If a man has committed evil deeds in a previous life he has to undergo the effects of those sins and while he is undergoing the effects of sins the fruits of sacrifices are postponed. But if the effects of sins have been extremely reduced he secures the fruits of *kāmya* rites in this very life. The words of the Veda laying down an injunction state only so much that the fruit of the rite performed does come about but they dc not say that the fruit follows immediately (after the rite is performed). Therefore, there is no definiteness (about the time when the fruit will follow). But svarga is to be enjoyed only in another life (as a fruit of rites performed in this life). It (svarga) means unequalled happiness and is achieved in a degree proportionate to the actions; but it cannot be enjoyed in this life, since men experience in this world every moment both happiness and misery. Every happiness is not the fruit of Jyotiṣṭoma and every being does not perform Jyotiṣṭoma. But some happiness does come to a man. Therefore, it (happiness) is natural. The existence, however, of another body has to be imagined for the experience of unequalled happiness, there being no other reasonable explanation. That unequalled happiness does not come to a man unless he dies; therefore svarga is to be enjoyed in another life.

9. *Mokṣa* (liberation): Neither the P. M. S. nor Śabara nor Prabhākara deals with the topic of Mokṣa. Kumārila and

---

1971. पुत्रादीनि कामयमानस्योपायो विधीयते। उपाये च कृते नियतमुपेयेन भवितव्यम्। तदा पूर्वजन्मन्यशुभं कृतम्। तच्चानुभाव्यं तस्मात्पूर्वजन्मकृतमनुभूयते। तत्र यदि जन्मान्तरकृतोऽधर्मः प्रक्षीणस्तत इहैव जन्मनि फलम्। अथाक्षीणस्ततस्तेन बद्धसाधकं फलमुत्कृष्यते। फलं भवतीत्येतावति विधिशब्दोऽस्ति न त्वनन्तरत्वे तस्माद्नियमः। स्वर्गस्तु जन्मान्तर एव। स हि निरतिशया प्रीतिः कर्मानुरूपा चेति न शक्येह जन्मन्यनुभवितुम्। यतोऽस्मिँल्लोके क्षणे, क्षणे सुखदुःखे अनुभवन्ति। न च प्रीतिमात्रं ज्योतिष्टोमफलम्। प्राणिमात्रस्य च सा विद्यते न च प्राणिमात्रं ज्योतिष्टोमं करोति। तस्मात्स्वाभाविक्यसौ। देहान्तरं तु निरतिशयप्रीत्यनुभवनायान्यथानुपपत्त्या कल्प्यते। तच्चामृतस्य न भवतीत्यतो जन्मान्तरे स्वर्गः। टुप्टीका on IV. 3.28. It should be noticed that a distintion is drawn here between *prīti* (a moment of happiness) and *niratiśaya-prīti*. The टुप्टीका on VI. 1. 1 says that the siddhānta view is that svarga means 'prīti' (happiness), while the pūrvapakṣa holds that svarga signifies the means for things that cause happiness, but both do not hold that svarga is some place 'एकस्य प्रीतिः स्वर्गशब्दवाच्या, अपरस्य प्रीतिमद् द्रव्यम्। विशिष्टो देश उभयोरप्यवाच्यः' टुप्टीका on पू. मी. सू. VI. 1. 1 p. 1348.

Prakaraṇapañcikā deal with it. They both say that liberation consists in not having to assume a body again.[1972] The Ślokavārtika states 'one desiring Mokṣa should not do any act that is forbidden or is *Kāmya* (prescribed for those who desire an object like riches, son &c); he should perform obligatory rites (such as agnihotra) and *naimittika* (like bath, japa and gifts on eclipse &c.) in order to avoid the sin that would accrue owing to non-performance of those two; if he does not desire the rewards of doing nitya and naimittika acts they will not come to him, as such a reward comes to him who seeks it. The results of acts in a former life would be eliminated by undergoing them in the life in which he seeks liberation. This differs from Śaṅkarācārya's position who holds on V. S. IV. 3. 14 that, as declared in the Śvet. Up. III. 8, there is no other way to Mokṣa except knowledge and realization of the Ātman. In his bhāṣya on the same sūtra he seems to attack[1973] Kumārila's position. According to Kumārila Upaniṣad passages about the knowledge of the Ātman are only arthavādas as they convey to the performer the knowledge that he has a soul and that the soul has certain characteristics, while Śaṅkara maintains (on V. S. I. 1. 1) that the phala, the subject of investigation and the Vedic exhortation (codanā) are different in Pūrvamīmāṁsā and in Brahamamīmāṁsā. There exist smṛtis that ridiculed the idea that the mere

---

1972. तत्र ज्ञानात्मतत्त्वानां भोगात् पूर्वक्रियाक्षये । उत्तरप्रचयासत्त्वाद्देहो नोत्पद्यते पुनः ॥ ... मोक्षार्थी न प्रवर्तेत तत्र काम्यनिषिद्धयोः । नित्यनैमित्तिके कुर्यात्प्रत्यवायजिहासया । प्रार्थ्यमानं फलं ज्ञातं न चानिच्छोर्भविष्यति । आत्मज्ञे चैतदस्तीति तज्ज्ञानमुपयुज्यते । श्लोकवा. (सम्बन्धाक्षेप° vv. 108, 110-111). On v. 111 न्या. र. quotes गीता VI. 1 अनाश्रितः कर्मफलं कार्यं कर्म करोति यः ।; the टुप्टीका on VI. 3. 2 propounds the same views. 'उपात्तदुरितक्षयार्थानि नित्यानीति भट्टादिभिरभ्युपगमात्' चन्द्रिका on नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धि I. 83; प्रकरणपञ्चिका p. 156 says, 'न अविद्यास्तमयो मोक्षः । आत्यन्तिकस्तु देहोच्छेदो निःशेषधर्माधर्मपरिक्षयनिबन्धनो मोक्ष इति सिद्धम् ।'.

1973. Vide the passage (in शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. IV. 3.14) यत्तु कैश्चित्कल्प्यते नित्यानि नैमित्तिकानि कर्माण्यनुष्ठीयन्ते प्रत्यवायानुत्पत्तये काम्यानि प्रतिषिद्धानि च परिह्रियन्ते स्वर्गनरकानवाप्तये सांप्रतदेहोपभोग्यानि च कर्माण्युपभोगेनैव क्षप्यन्त इत्यतो वर्तमानदेहपातादूर्ध्वं देहान्तरप्रतिसन्धानकारणाभावात्स्वरूपावस्थानलक्षणं कैवल्यं विनापि ब्रह्मात्मतयैवंवृत्तस्य सेत्स्यतीति । तदसत् । प्रमाणाभावात् ।. The तन्त्रवार्तिक on पू. मी. सू. I. 2. 7 remarks 'एतेन क्रत्वर्थकर्तृप्रतिपादनद्वारेणोपनिषदां नैराकाङ्क्ष्यं व्याख्यातम् ।' p. 114 and श्लोकवा. (सम्बन्धाक्षेप°) verses 103-104 'आत्मा ज्ञातव्य इत्येतन्मोक्षार्थं न च चोदितम् । कर्मप्रवृत्तिहेतुत्वमात्मज्ञानस्य लक्ष्यते । विज्ञाते चास्य पारार्थ्ये यापि नाम फलश्रुतिः । साऽर्थवादो भवेदेव न स्वर्गादेः फलान्तरम् ' ॥ ; सुरेश्वर's वार्तिक on तैत्तिरीयोपनिषद्भाष्य (शिक्षाध्याय I. 9-10) quotes the verses मोक्षार्थी न प्रवर्तेत &c. cited in note 1972 and remarks इति मीमांसकंमन्यैः कर्मोक्तं मोक्षसाधनम् ।

knowledge of the Self would lead to Mokṣa. For example,[1974] the Bṛ. Y. Y. affirms that both knowledge and actions lead to Liberation, that to say that knowledge alone leads to liberation is a sign of indolence, that out of the fear of bodily labour ignorant men do not want to engage in actions.

The doctrines of the early and principal writers on Pūrvamīmāṁsā are rather quaint and startling. Their arguments about the eternality and self-existence of the Veda are fallacious and were not accepted even by other ancient Indian systems. Both Prabhākara and Kumārila have in their scheme no place for God as the dispenser of rewards or as the ruler of man's destiny, as being pleased with men's prayers. They do not expressly deny the existence of God, but they assign to God or the deities mentioned in the Vedic texts a secondary role or rather practically no role at all. They raise yajña to the position of God and their dogmas about yajña seem to be based upon a sort of commercial or business-like system,[1975] viz. one should do so many acts, dispense gifts to priests, offer certain offerings, observe certain ethical rules and other rules of conduct (such as not eating flesh, subsisting on milk)[1976] and then the reward would follow without the intervention of God. There is hardly any appeal to religious emotions, there is no omniscient Being, no Creator and no creation of the world. The Pūrvamīmāṁsā no doubt lays emphasis on (the rights and) duties of man in life. The other darśanas are far more concerned with the question of escaping permanently from the world and with man's destiny after death. The P. M. S, Śabara and Kumārila, however, make substantial contributions to the exegesis of Vedic

---

1974. ज्ञानं प्रधानं न तु कर्महीनं कर्म प्रधानं न तु बुद्धिहीनम्। तस्माद् द्वयोरेव भवेत सिद्धिर्न ह्येकपक्षो विहगः प्रयाति॥ परिज्ञानाद्भवेन्मुक्तिरेतदालस्यलक्षणम्। कायक्लेशभयाच्चैव कर्म नेच्छन्त्यपण्डिताः॥ बृहद्योगिया. IX. 29,.34 q. by कृत्यकल्प° (on मोक्ष) p. 146.

1975. For a striking example of the spirit of bargaining with God, vide the mantra देहि मे ददामि ते नि मे धेहि नि ते दधे। निहारमिन्नि मे हरा निहारं नि हरामि ते॥ तै. सं. I. 8. 4. 1–2, वा. सं. III. 50 (with slight variations); compare अथर्ववेद III. 15. 6.

1976. Vide Tai. S. II. 5. 5. 6. about one engaged in Darśapūrṇamāsa; तस्यैतद्व्रतं नानृतं वदेन्न मांसमश्नीयान्न स्त्रियमुपेयान्नास्य पल्पूलनेन वासः पल्पूलयेयुः' and तै. सं. VI. 2.5. 2–3 where पयः, यवागूः and आमिक्षा are prescribed as the proper food for a ब्राह्मण, क्षत्रिय and वैश्य sacrificer respectively. Jaimini (IV. 3. 8–9) declares that this is *kratvartha* (obligatory). Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 1139–1140 for the observances of the person who has undergone dīkṣā (consecration) for an Agniṣṭoma sacrifice.

texts. There are about three thousand quotations in Śabara's bhāṣya, out of which several hundred have not been yet identified. At least one thousand of these are taken from the Tai. S. and Br. About twelve adhikaraṇas are concerned with the Adhrigupraiṣa (a long formula) which is quoted in H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1121 note 2504. Some adhikaraṇas are devoted to the explanation of certain words in that praiṣa e. g. PMS IX. 4. 22 explains urūka as 'vapā', IX. 4. 23-24 explain 'praśasā', IX. 4. 25-27 explain five words (śyena, śalā, kaśyapa, kavaṣa, srekaparṇa). Similarly, X. 1. 32 explains the word *bṛsaya* as meaning 'bṛhat.' Śabara's and Kumārila's stands on the individual soul and mokṣa confer on the P. M. system some status as a philosophical one. For a systematic and exhaustive study of Śabara's contribution to Vedic and post-vedic exegesis, vide Dr. S. V. Garge's citations in Śābara-bhāṣya' pp. 140–213 (Poona, 1952).

The doctrine that the Veda is eternal and of absolute and unquestioned authority has led to certain undesirable tendencies. Propounders of new doctrines make great efforts to show that there is Vedic authority for what they hold. For example, the sūtras in V. S. I. 1. 5–18 are concerned to show that the Upaniṣads do not postulate Pradhāna as the cause of the world, as the Sāṅkhyas imagine. Śaṅkarācārya expressly states that the Sāṅkhyas explain Vedānta passages as favourable to their theories and therefore a refutation of their arguments was[1977] provided in V. S. I. 1. 5–18. It has been shown above how followers of Śākta worship try to interpret a verse like Ṛgveda V. 47. 4 (catvāra īm bibhrati &c) as referring to the Śākta doctrines and how treatises dignified with the title of Upaniṣads were produced by Śākta writers such as the Bhāvanopaniṣad. Śabara in his bhāṣya on PMS. I. 1. 5 states that the Vijñānavādi Bauddhas put forward Bṛ. Up. IV. 5. 13 (Vijñānaghana evaitebhyo bhūtebhyaḥ samutthāya tānyevānuvinaśyati na pretya sañjñāsti) as supporting their position. One of the most glaring examples of this tendency is the explanation of Ṛg. I. 141. 1–3 by Ānandatīrtha, also called Madhvācārya, who in 'Mahābhārata–tātparya–nirṇaya' claims to be the third incarnation of Vāyu, the other two being Hanūmat and Bhīmasena, one

---

1977. सांख्यादयस्तु परिनिष्ठितं वस्तु प्रमाणान्तरगम्यमेवेति मन्यमानाः प्रधानादीनि कारणान्तराण्यनुमिमानास्तत्परतयैव वेदान्तवाक्यानि योजयन्ति। शङ्कर on वे. सू. I. 1. 5; सांख्यादयः स्वपक्षस्थापनाय वेदान्तवाक्यान्यप्युदाहृत्य स्वपक्षानुगुण्येनैव योजयन्तो व्याचक्षते। शङ्कर on वे. सू. II. 2. I.

of the Pāṇḍavas, and who endeavours to interpret Ṛg. I. 141. 1-3 as referring to these three avatāras.[1978] The words 'Madhvaḥ' and 'Mātariśvā' (meaning 'wind-god') occur in Ṛg. I. 141. 3. This was deemed sufficient to claim that Madhva, the propounder of the Dvaita system, was mentioned in the Ṛgveda. I do not know how Madhvācārya would have met the charge of Veda not being eternal if it referred to Bhīmasena (who even according to the traditional account in the Mahābhārata lived at the end of Dvāpara age i. e. about 5000 years ago) and to Madhva himself who lived barely seven centuries ago. The Veda would be later than these dates. The argument that this refers to a previous Kalpa would not be available to rebut the charge, as the Kalpa, Manvantara and Mahāyuga when Bhīma and Madhvācārya flourished and in the present day are the same. There was no *pralaya* (dissolution of the world) at the end of Dvāpara and Kaliyuga immediately set in. The Bhārata war was fought between Dvāpara and Kali (Ādiparva 2. 13) and Kaliyuga was about to start at the time of that war (vide Vanaparva 'etat kaliyugam nāmācirād-yad pravartate' and Śalya 60. 25 '(prāptam Kaliyugam viddhi)'. It is on account of this pretention that he was very roughly handled by eminent writers like Appayya-dīkṣita who charges Madhva with citing fabricated Vedic and other texts in support of his doctrines. Vide I. A. vol. 62 at p. 189 where the writer, Shri Venkatasubbiah, sets out over thirty works mentioned by Madhva which he states occur nowhere else. M. M. Chinnaswami, who has edited (Benares, 1941) Appayya's work in 60 verses with the commentary of Appayya called Madhvamata-vidhvaṁsana and notes of his own, sets out on p. 4 thirty-six unknown works and the sūtras where they are cited by Appayya.

1978. तनुस्तृतीया पवनस्य सेयं सद्भारतार्थप्रतिपादनाय । ग्रन्थं चकारेमसुदीर्णविद्या यस्मिन् रमन्ते हरिपादभक्ताः ॥ तृतीयमस्य वृषभस्य दोहसे दशप्रमतिं जनयन्त योषणः । निर्यदीं बुध्नान्महिषस्य वर्पस ईशानासः शवसा क्रन्त सूरयः । यदीमनु प्रदिवो मध्व आधवे गुहा सन्तं मातरिश्वा मथायति ॥; यस्य त्रीण्युदितानि वेदवचने रूपाणि दिव्यान्यलं बट् तद्दर्शतमित्थमेव निहितं देवस्य भर्गो महत् । वायो रामवचोनयं प्रथमकं पृक्षो द्वितीयं वपुर्मध्वो यत्तु तृतीयमेतदधुना ग्रन्थः कृतः केशवे ॥ महाभारततात्पर्यनिर्णय chap. 32 verses 176-181 (Nirn. ed. of 1911; तृतीय ...योषणः form latter half of Ṛg. I. 141. 2 and निर्यदीं...मथायति is Ṛg. I. 141. 3. Ṛg. I, 141. 1 begins with बळित्था. In the भाष्य on ब्रह्मसूत्र the verse यस्य etc. quoted here reads the last line as 'मध्वो यत्तु तृतीयकं कृतमिदं भाष्यं हरौ तेन हि'. The celebrated Appayyadikṣita delivered a heavy onslaught on Madhvācārya in his मध्वतन्त्रमुखमर्दन (Ānan.) for this claim of avatāraship.

It is remarkable that great ācāryas like Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja never claimed in their own works that they were the avatāras of some deity. It was left to their disciples to say so, if at all.

Having established that Veda is eternal and self existent the Mimāmsakas give free rein to their ingenuity, powers of reasoning and logic. They have a logic of their own which governed not only the interpretation of Vedic passages but also of the Smṛtis and the medieval works on Dharmaśāstra (including law and procedure). As Colebrooke, one of the most accurate and level-headed of Western scholars of Sanskrit, said more than 130 years ago 'the disquisitions on the mīmāmsā bear therefore a certain resemblance to juridical questions; and in fact, the Hindu law being blended with the religion of the people, the same modes of reasoning are applicable and are applied to the one as to the other. The logic of the Mimansa is the logic of the law; the rule of interpretation of civil and religious ordinances. Each case is examined and determined upon and from the cases decided the principles may be collected. A well-ordered arrangement of them would constitute the philosophy of law and this is in truth what has been attempted in the Mimansa' (Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I. pp. 316–317, Madras ed. of 1837).

The first division of Vedic material is into *Mantra* and *Brāhmaṇa*. It has been already stated above (p. 1096 note 1776) that those are mantras that are recognized as such by the learned. P. M. S. (II. 1. 31–32) provides[1979] that mantra is that which simply asserts (and is not hortatory) or (to say the same thing in another way) 'those are mantras that are so called on account of their asserting something'. On P. M. S. I. 4. 1 Śabara describes mantra as one that at the time when the procedure of a sacrifice is being followed, recalls or reminds or makes clear to the performer the matter that is prescribed e. g. 'I cut (the blades of) kuśa grass that is an abode for the deity'. This is only a general description of mantra and not an accurate definition. Mantras are not supposed to be useful in sacrifices by

---

1979 अपि वा प्रयोगसामर्थ्यान्मन्त्रोऽभिधानवाची स्यात्। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 31; शाबरभाष्य 'प्रयोगे क्रियमाणेऽस्य सामर्थ्यं विद्यते गोदानं गोयागं च प्रत्याययितुं न विधातुम्'; तच्चोदकेषु मन्त्राख्या। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 32; शाबरभाष्य 'अभिधानस्य चोदकेष्वेवंजातीयकेष्वभियुक्ता उपदिशन्ति मन्त्रानधीमहे, मन्त्रानध्यापयामः, मन्त्रा वर्तन्त इति'।; the तन्त्रवार्तिक dissolves 'तच्चोदकेषु' as तत् अभिधानं चोदकं प्रयोजकं येषामिति बहुव्रीहिः। कश्चिन्मन्त्रो यो विहितमर्थं प्रयोगकाले प्रकाशयति। यथा बर्हिर्देवसदनं दामि इत्येवमादि। शबर on पू. मी. सू. I. 4. 1. बर्हिर्देव° occurs in मै. सं. I. 1, 2.

their mere utterance (*uccāraṇa*) but are really '*abhidhāyaka*' (reminders of what is to be done or is being done). Śabara remarks that *lakṣaṇa* is the only way for the recognition of mantras and not an enumeration of some characteristics of mantras as done by the Vṛttikāra such as these viz.[1980] some end in 'asi' (thou art) or '*tvā*' as in Tai. S. I. 1. 1 'iṣe tvā', prayer or wish (as in 'āyurdhā asi' in Tai. S. I. 6. 6. 1), praise ('agnir mūrdhā divaḥ' in Tai. S. IV. 4. 4). Śabara points out that 'asi' and 'tvā' occur even in the middle of mantras, the other characteristics such as blessing and praise are found in Brāhmaṇas also. The M. B. P. remarks that there are (p. 66) one hundred kinds of mantras and that if we take into account the fourteen Vedic metres and their sub-varieties there would be 273 different varieties of *ṛk* mantras alone (p. 67). There are certain texts regarded as mantras (e. g. 'Vasantāya kapiñjalān-ālabhate' Vāj. S. 24. 20) which are not merely assertive but rather relate to the procedure of a yāga (in the case of Vāj. S. 24. 20, of Aśvamedha).

Mantras are classified under three heads viz. Ṛk, Sāman and Yajus. These are defined in P. M. S. II. 1, 35-37; the name ṛk is applied to those[1981] mantras that are divided into feet, metrical *pādas* (often) based on the meaning. Sāman is the name applied to Vedic mantras that are sung. It has been established in P. M. S. VII. 2. 1-21 and IX. 2. 1-2 that the mantra[1982] texts are not called Sāman but only the music, that

---

1980. ऋषयोऽपि पदार्थानां नान्तं यान्ति पृथक्त्वशः। लक्षणेन तु सिद्धानामन्तं यान्ति विपश्चितः। q. by शबर on II. 1. 32; तन्त्रवार्तिक proposes to read this very śloka as 'ऋषयोऽपि हि लक्ष्याणां'.

1981. तेषामृग्यत्रार्थवशेन पादव्यवस्था। गीतिषु सामाख्या। शेषे यजुःशब्दः। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 35-37. In अग्निमीळे पुरोहितं (Ṛg. I. 1. 1) the first pāda has a complete sense, but in अग्निः पूर्वेभिर्ऋषिभिरीड्यो नूतनैरुत (Ṛg. I. 1. 2) the meaning is not complete in the first pāda. Therefore, the only definition is 'पादव्यवस्था' and अर्थवशेन is only illustrative as शबर says 'यतो नार्थवशेनेति वृत्तादिवशव्यावृत्त्यर्थं, किं तर्हि अनुवाद एष प्रदर्शनार्थः। ... तस्माद्यत्र पादकृता व्यवस्था सा ऋगिति'

1982. तस्माद्गीतयः सामानि न प्रगीतानि मन्त्रवाक्यानि। शबर on IX. 2. 2; सामवेदे सहस्रं गीत्युपायाः। ... गीतिर्नाम क्रिया। सा आभ्यन्तरप्रयत्नजनितस्वरविशेषाणामभिव्यञ्जिका। सा सामशब्दाभिलप्या। सा नियतपरिमाणा। ऋचि च गीयते। शबर on पू. मी. सू. IX. 2. 29. In the महाभाष्य on the Vārtika सर्वे देशान्तरे in the first आह्निक we read चत्वारो वेदाः साङ्गाः सरहस्या बहुधा भिन्ना एकशतमध्वर्युशाखाः सहस्रवर्त्मा सामवेद एकविंशतिधा बाह्वृच्यं नवधाथर्वणो वेदः &c. Here the word शाखा is *not used in relation to* सामवेद but the word वर्त्मन् (way). As शबर expressly

(*Continued on next page*)

giti is an action which manifests various tunes owing to the internal effort made by the singer and in order to bring about the musical effect the singer has to resort to modifications of the letters of the ṛk, to disjunction (of parts of it), to omission (of a letter), to repetition, to pauses, to [1983] *stobha*. In VII.2. 1–21 the PMS establishes that the words 'Rathantara-sāman', 'Bṛhat-sāman' refer only to the music and not to the *ṛk* or basic text set to music. Yajus means those Vedic mantras that are neither *ṛk* nor *sāman*. There is another word 'nigada' applied to certain mantras that are addressed to others as directions to do certain acts and are uttered loudly such as 'agnīdagnīn vihara', 'prokṣaṇīrāsādaya, 'idhmābarhirupasādaya'. They are Yajus (i. e. in prose), the only difference being that they are loudly uttered (in order that the persons to whom they are addressed may hear them), while ordinary Yajus is uttered inaudibly. Vide P. M. S. II. 1. 38–45 for discussion on Nigadas and Mai. S. III. 6. 5 for 'uccair-ṛcā kriyata uccaiḥ sāmopāṁśu yajuṣā'.

Mantra and Brāhmaṇa constitute the Veda. The P. M. S. [1984] states that all those parts of the Veda that are not or cannot be called Mantra constitute Brāhmaṇa. Śabara notes that the Vṛttikāra, in order to enable students to decide what texts are Brāhmaṇa texts, pointed out certain characteristics found in Brāhmaṇa texts such as abounding in the word 'iti' or 'ityāha' (so it is said), anecdote, stating the reason for an injunction, etymology, condemnation, praise, doubt, injunction, instance where another did something of the same kind, what happened in

---

(*Continued from last page*)

says that in सामवेद there are a thousand गीत्युपायs, सहस्रवर्त्मा means 'सहस्रगीत्युपायवान्' and it is not correct to render सहस्रवर्त्मा as सहस्रशाखः, as many scholars do. The विष्णुपुराण III. 6 gives a confused account of the recensions of the सामवेद, verses 3 and 6 speaking of 1000 संहिताs propagated by सुकर्मा and 24 संहिताs propagated by a pupil of हिरण्यनाभ respectively.

1983. Stobhas are musical interjections and flourishes added or introduced in the chants such as 'hāū, haī, ī, ū, hum'. Vide Chān. Up. (I. 13. 1–3) where hum is said to be the 13th stobha and undefinable (identified with highest Brahma) and the other 12 stobhas are specified among which are हाउ, हाइ, ई, ऊ &c. Vide Jai. IX. 2. 39 (adhikam ca vivarṇam ca Jaimineḥ stobhaśabdatvāt).

1984. शेषे ब्राह्मणशब्दः। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 33; 'मन्त्राश्च ब्राह्मणं च वेदः। तत्र मन्त्रलक्षण उक्ते परिशेषसिद्धत्वात् ब्राह्मणलक्षणमवचनीयं मन्त्रलक्षणवचनेनैव सिद्धम्। शबर.

past ages, changing the meaning after considering the context.[1985] Śabara also quotes two verses summarising under ten heads the characteristics of Brāhmaṇa texts, points out that all this is only illustrative and that the characteristics mentioned by the Vṛttikāra sometimes occur in mantras also, such as 'iti' in Ṛg. X. 119. 1, 'ityāha' in Ṛg. VII. 41. 2, 'ākhyāyikā' as in Ṛg. I. 116. 3, reason (*hetu*) in Ṛg. I. 2. 4. The Ṛgveda alone contains over ten thousand mantras. Hardly one-third of them are employed in all the Vedic rites. The rest are employed in *japa*. Besides, the other Vedas also have thousands of mantras. Therefore, no formal definition of mantra is attempted and all that is stated is that mantras are those which have been recognised as such by the [1986] learned.

Brāhmaṇas are attached to each Veda, such as the Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas to the Ṛgveda, the Taittirīya to the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda, the Śatapatha to the Śukla Yajurveda, the Tāṇḍya to the Sāmaveda and Gopatha to the Yajurveda. The Brāhmaṇas contain the oldest known specimens of prose in Indo-European languages, though prose formulas (probably earlier in date than those in the Brāhmaṇas) are found in the Kṛṣṇa and Śukla Yajurveda Saṁhitās. They are the primary source of information about sacrifices, ritual and priests. They contain numerous myths and legends put forward for illustrating ritual and sacrifices. They often mention contests between gods and *asuras* (titans) and abound in etymologies. Their contents can be divided into two broad classes, viz. injunctive (hortatory) passages (vidhis) and explanatory (or laudatory) passages (arthavādas). The scope and purpose of arthavādas will be explained later on. But one important point to be noted is that the Mīmāṁsakas are strongly opposed to holding that any part of the Veda, even the smallest, is useless or meaningless.

It is now time to see how the Mīmāṁsakas deal with the contents of the Veda. The extant Vedic literature is of

---

1985. हेतुर्निर्वचनं निन्दा प्रशंसा संशयो विधिः। परक्रिया पुराकल्पो व्यवधारणकल्पना। उपमानं दशैते तु विधयो ब्राह्मणस्य तु। एतत् स्यात् सर्ववेदेषु नियतं विधिलक्षणम्॥ q. by शबर on II. 1. 33. The तन्त्रवा. explains that the word विधि in विधिलक्षण here means ब्राह्मण. About व्यवधारणकल्पना it says 'यत्रान्यथार्थः प्रतिभातः पौर्वापर्यालोचनेन व्यवधार्य अन्यथा कल्प्यते सा व्यवधारणकल्पना तद्यथा प्रतिगृह्णीयादिति श्रुतं प्रतिग्राहयेदिति कल्पयिष्यते।' and परकृति and पुराकल्प as 'एकपुरुषकर्तृकमुपाख्यानं परकृतिः बहुकर्तृकं पुराकल्पः.' The ब्रह्माण्डपुराण II. 34.63–64 explains 'अन्यस्यान्यस्य चोक्तिर्या बुधैः सोक्ता पुराकृतिः। यो ह्यत्यन्तपरोक्षार्थः स पुराकल्प उच्यते॥'

1986. स्वाध्याये पठ्यमानेषु येषु मन्त्रपदं स्मृतम्। ते मन्त्रा नाभिधानं हि मन्त्राणां लक्षणं स्थितम्॥ तन्त्रवार्तिक on पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 34.

enormous extent and of greatly varied content. Once it is admitted that the Veda is self-existent and not the work of any author, human or divine, every sentence in it apparently becomes of infallible authority. The Veda being the only means of knowing Dharma, the Mīmāṁsakas had to accept that whatever the Veda says was authoritative and binding on them, as Śabara [1987] admits. But many Vedic texts are apparently in conflict with each other and often are in conflict with ordinary experience. A few striking instances may be given to show how difficulties arose. The Tai. S. V. 2. 7 and Mai. S. state 'one should not pile the fire altar on (bare) earth, nor in the sky, nor in heaven'. [1988] No one can build a fire altar in the sky, nor in heaven. The Veda apparently prohibits something which is quite impossible and therefore this prohibition seems at first sight senseless. The Tai. Br. (III. 8. 10. 5) states that by offering the Pūrṇāhuti the performer secures all desired objects. If Pūrṇāhuti yields all objects, then one need not perform any further rites of Agnihotra &c. Does the Veda mean this? The Veda contains stories and legends about individuals e. g. Tai. S. mentions Babara Prāvāhaṇi who desired to be an eloquent speaker and therefore performed a sacrifice called Pañcarātra and secured his object. The Veda would then be later in time than this Babara and this would forfeit the claim of being eternal &c. Therefore, Śabara states that a story that never happened is described for the sake of praise. This may be an escape from a tight corner but the explanation does not redound

---

1987. शब्दप्रमाणका वयं यच्छब्द आह तदस्माकं प्रमाणम्। शबर on पू. मी. सू. III. 2. 36. These very words occur in the महाभाष्य on वार्तिक 9 in the first आह्निक.

1988. न पृथिव्यामग्निश्चेतव्यो नान्तरिक्षे न दिवि - इत्याहुः। अमृतं वै हिरण्यममृते वा एतदग्निश्चीयते। मै. सं. III. 2. 6. Vide P. M. S. I. 2. 5 and 18 on this and व्यवहारमयूख p. 202 (which says it is निषेधानुवादमात्रम्). All that is meant is that, just as agnicayana in the air or sky is not at all known, so doing it on bare earth also is unknown and it should be done after placing a piece *of gold on the ground.* This is a *stuti* (laudation) *of gold.* पूर्णाहुति is explained as पूर्णया स्रुचा आहुतिः by the com. on कात्यायनश्रौ. सू. IV. 10. 5. बबरः प्रावाहणिरकामयत वाचः प्रवदिता स्यामिति स एतं पञ्चरात्रमाहरत् तेनायजत ततो वै स वाचः प्रवदिताऽभवत्। य एवं विद्वान् पञ्चरात्रेण यजते प्रवदितैव वाचो भवत्यथो एनं वाचस्पतिरित्याहुः। तै. सं. VII. 1. 10. 2-3. प्रावाहणि would mean 'son of प्रवाहण'. Vide P. M. S., I. 2. 6 and 18 *for this.* शबर remarks 'असद्वृत्तान्तान्वाख्यानं स्तुत्यर्थेन प्रशंसाया गम्यमानत्वात्' on I. 2. 10, on which तन्त्रवा. remarks 'एवं वेदेपि विधिना तावत्फलमवगमितमर्थवादास्त्वसत्येन नाम प्ररोचयन्तु न तद्गते सत्यासत्यत्वे किंचित् कुप्यतः प्रवर्तनमात्रोपकारित्वात्। तस्मादुपाख्यानासत्यत्वमतन्त्रम्।' तन्त्रवा. on I. 2. 10.

to the credit of the Veda which is here admitted to have manufactured a non-existent story for pushing up one of its injunctions; besides, if people come to know from what Śabara says that the story is false, people would not be induced to go in for performing that rite. A true story might encourage persons to follow the prescription of the Veda in this case. The Tantravārtika (p. 125) on this explanation of Śabara tries to meet the objection raised here. Sometimes Veda is divided into three portions viz. Vidhi, Arthavāda and Mantra, names of yāgas like *udbhid* and *viśvajit* being placed under vidhi. The Ślokavārtika refers to this threefold division in its last verse.[1989] Though the whole Veda is the only means of right knowledge about what Dharma is i. e. what should be done and what should not be done, the different parts of the Veda are not all directly related to right knowledge about Dharma. Large portions of the Veda are related only mediately to the principal part.[1990] In one place Śabara very succintly but clearly defines the three classes of Vedic texts and illustrates them. The Veda is also divided into five parts viz. vidhi, arthavāda, mantra, nāmadheya and pratiṣedha. These five have already been mentioned above. Here some details will have to be added on each of these. Vidhi is an injunction (or exhortation) that is meaningful on account of enjoining a matter that has a (useful) purpose and it prescribes

---

1989. इति प्रमाणत्वमिदं प्रसिद्धं युक्त्येह धर्मं प्रति चोदनायाः। अतःपरं तु प्रविभज्य वेदं त्रेधा ततो वक्ष्यति यस्य योऽर्थः॥ q. in मी. बा. प्र. p. 7; on this न्या. र. remarks 'तेन सिद्धेपि चोदनाप्रामाण्ये ततःपरं विध्यर्थवादमन्त्रात्मना वेदं त्रेधा विभज्य तत्स्तुत्यादिप्रयोजनप्रतिपादनेन कृत्स्नस्य वेदस्य तन्मूलयोश्च स्मृत्याचारयोर्धर्मं प्रति प्रामाण्यमुपरितने पादत्रये प्रतिपादयिष्यत इति समस्तोऽध्यायः प्रमाणलक्षणं, नैवेह समाप्तमिति।'. On the पूर्वपक्षसूत्र 'उक्तं समाम्नायैदमर्थ्यं तस्मात् सर्वं तदर्थं स्यात्' (पू. मी. सू. I. 4. 1.) शबर states 'कश्चिदस्य (वेदस्य) भागो विधिर्योऽविदितमर्थं वेदयति यथा सोमेन यजेतेति। कश्चिदर्थवादो यः प्ररोचयन् विधिं स्तौति यथा वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवता इति। कश्चिन्मन्त्रो यो विहितमर्थं प्रयोगकाले प्रकाशयति यथा बर्हिर्देवसदनं दामि-इत्येवमादिः। अयं अर्थः यस्य सः इदमर्थः तस्य भावः ऐदमर्थ्यम्।. समाम्नाय means वेद. उक्तं refers to पू. मी. सू. I. 2. 1 (आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वात् &c).

1990. The शास्त्रदीपिका on I. 4. 1 states 'तत्र चोदनैव साक्षात्प्रमाणम्। अर्थवादमन्त्रस्मृतिनामधेयानि तच्छेषत्वेन तन्मूलत्वेन च प्रमाणं भवन्तीति धर्मप्रमितेरितिकर्तव्यतास्थाने नियतं निपतन्ति।' (p. 54). That विधि means something not known before or from another source follows from the पूर्वपक्षसूत्र I. 2. 19 विधिर्वा स्यादपूर्वत्वात् &c. On I. 4. 4 (p. 333) शबर says 'अविदितवेदनं च विधिरित्युच्यते।', अज्ञातस्य हि ज्ञापनं विधिः। शबर on X. 3. 20; on I. 4. 8 p. 339 'यद्यज्ञातस्ततो विधिः, यदि ज्ञातस्ततोऽनुवादः। ... न ह्याख्यातमन्तरेण कृत्यं वा नामशब्दार्थव्यापारो विधीयते।', this last states that ordinarily a vidhi is laid down by a verbal form or by a potential passive participle (ending in य, तव्य, or अनीय).

something that does not follow (or is not established by) from any other authority. Śabara himself describes in many places what vidhi means. For example, the injunction 'one desirous of (attaining) Heaven should offer Agnihotra' prescribes (the performance of) homa that does not follow from any other authority and that has a beneficial purpose, its meaning being 'by the Agnihotra offering one should effect (the attainment of) svarga'. Where, however, a rite is otherwise established, all that can be done is only to enjoin an accessory with regard to it. Thus in the sentence 'one should offer an oblation with curds' the homa being already established by the words 'one should offer Agnihotra (if one desires heaven)' all that is enjoined is the offering of curds with regard to it, the meaning being 'by curds one should effect the oblation'. Vide Ṭup-ṭikā on P. M. S. VI, 3, 17 and M. N. P. p. 17 (B. O. R. I ed.).[1991]

The collection of vidhis in the Vedic texts forms the core of the Veda and refers to many specific rites. The central element in a vidhi is the verb or verbal form, which will be analysed later on. The question is: how is one to recognize a vidhi. Śabara quotes a verse which those who know the propositions about the meanings of words and sentences declare traditionally, viz. in all the Vedas the fixed (or definite) sign of a vidhi is the words 'one shall do', 'it should be done', 'it ought to be done', 'it should be so', it ought to be so'.[1992] From this it follows that a vidhi is ordinarily couched in the optative form (called vidhiliṅg in Sanskrit), and that a verb in the present tense cannot ordinarily be taken as laying down a vidhi.[1993] But sometimes a vidhi may be inferred even from a text in which the verb is in the present tense. For example, there is a vedic text occurring in the Mahāpitṛyajña which states 'he should follow holding the

---

1991. यत्र तु कर्म प्रकारान्तरेण प्राप्तं तत्र तदुद्देशेन गुणमात्रविधानम्। यथा 'दध्ना जुहुयात्' इत्यत्र होमस्य 'अग्निहोत्रं जुहुयात्' इत्यनेन प्राप्तत्वात् होमोद्देशेन दधिमात्रविधानम्, दध्ना होमं भावयेत् इति। मी. न्या. प्र. p. 17.

1992. एवं हि पदवाक्यार्थन्यायविदः श्लोकमामनन्ति। कुर्यात् क्रियेत कर्तव्यं भवेत्स्यादिति पञ्चमम्। एतत्स्यात्सर्ववेदेषु नियतं विधिलक्षणम्॥ शबर on पू. मी. सू. IV. 3. 3.

1993. शबर himself says on पू. मी. सू. I. 3. 13 'ऋत्विजो वृणीते ... देवयजनमध्यवस्यन्तीति। नात्र विधिर्गम्यते वर्तमानकालप्रत्ययनिर्देशात् न चात्र वाक्यशेषः स्तावकोऽस्ति।' and on III. 4. 15 (while discussing तै. सं. II. 5. 2. 4 तस्माज्जञ्जभ्यमानोऽनुब्रूयान्मयि दक्षक्रतू इति प्राणापानावेवात्मन्धत्ते) 'नात्र विधायकं शब्दमुपलभामहे य एष प्राणापानावेवात्मन्धत्ते इति। वर्तमानापदेश एष न विधायकः स्तावकस्तु भवति मन्त्रवचनस्य'; similarly, on IV. 1. 32 (p. 1215) 'नात्र विधिविभक्तिः, वर्तमानापदेशो ह्ययमिति।'. मेधातिथि on मनु V. 40 employs very similar words.

fuelstick below the handle of the ladle in the pitṛyajña, since the performer of rites for the gods holds the fuel-stick above the handle.[1994] This has been construed as a vidhi (exhortation) and not as a mere arthavāda. Another example is that of Rātrisattras (Soma sacrifices occupying more than twelve days). A passage in the context of Rātrisattras states 'those who perform *rātrisattra* attain stability (or fame), are endowed with *brahma* lustre and eat or possess food'. This looks like a mere praise (arthavāda) of the performance of rātrisattras, but really it is a vidhi about the reward of rātrisattra mentioned in the above passage and states an exception to the rule that svarga is the reward of a rite in which no reward is specified by the Vedic texts. This is employed in the Mit. on Yāj. III. 226 which states that the sin committed through ignorance is removed by the performance of penances. Ordinarily, a sinful act is deemed to be destroyed by undergoing the penalty that God may inflict, but Yāj. states a special rule. Medhātithi on Manu V. 40 (stating that animals, birds and herbs dying by being offered in yajñas reach higher levels) says that this is merely an arthavāda and no vidhi can be imagined from this by the maxim of Rātrisattra.[1995] Vide Par. M. (I. 1. p. 149) which holds that an

---

1994. विष्टगताग्निहोत्रे महापितृयज्ञे वा श्रूयते। अधस्तात्समिधं धारयन्ननुद्रवेदुपरि हि देवेभ्यो धारयति। quoted by तन्त्रवा. on III. 4. 6 (Śabara has dropped this sūtra along with five preceding ones); it then proceeds 'पित्र्ये होमेऽधस्तात् स्रुग्दण्डस्य समिद्धारयितव्या।' दैवे च पुनरुपरिष्टादिति। विधित्वे चैवमादीनामुक्तः कल्पनाप्रकारः। तस्माद्विधिरिति॥' p. 899. It may be noted that the स्मृतिच. (I. pp. 72-73) mentions this Vedic passage and the conclusion in its discussion about the validity of marriage with one's maternal uncle's daughter or one's paternal aunt's daughter, after quoting a Śatapatha text I. 8. 3. 6 'तस्मात्समानादेव पुरुषादत्ता चाद्यश्च जायेते इदं हि चतुर्थे पुरुषे तृतीये संगच्छामहे इति विदेवं दीव्यमाना जात्या आसते' (where the verbs are in the present tense and not in the optative mood and yet the Sm. C. holds that it is not a mere anuvāda, but it leads to the formulation of a vidhi). Vide also परा. मा. I. 2. pp. 66-67 for a similar treatment. It was held that the use of words like 'hi' indicating a reason or 'vai' (indicating what is well-known) is not generally allowed in a vidhi. Vide शबर on पू. मी. सू. IX. 1. 41 (p. 1690) 'न च विधीयमाने वैशब्दो भवति प्रसिद्धवचनो ह्येष शब्दः, न वै स्त्रैणानि सख्यानि सन्ति— इति यथा।'. न वै &c. occurs in Ṛg. X. 95. 15.

1995. रात्रीः प्रकृत्य श्रूयते। प्रतितिष्ठन्ति ह वा य एता रात्रीरुपयन्ति। ब्रह्मवर्चस्विनोऽन्नादा भवन्ति य एता उपयन्ति। The words प्रति... यन्ति occur in ताण्ड्यमहाब्राह्मण 23. 2. 4. This is considered in पू. मी. सू. IV. 3. 17-19. The टुप्टीका holds that there is a विधि here. The मिता० on Yāj III. 226 says 'न चेदमर्थवादमात्रम्। अधिकारिविशेषणाकाङ्क्षायां रात्रिसत्रन्यायेनार्थवादिकफलस्यैव कल्पनाया न्याय्यत्वात्। अतो युक्तं प्रायश्चित्तैरपैत्येन इति।'. This अधिकरण contains an exception to the

(*Continued on next page*)

adhikāravidhi about one desirous of stability has been assumed from the passage about rātrisattra. Raghunandana in Ekādaśītattva (p. 28) explains the sūtras (P. M. S. IV. 3. 17–19) and illustrates this *nyāya*.

Following the Vedas, the Smṛtis also lay down numerous vidhis by means of verbal optative forms or participles ending in 'ya, tavya &c.'. For example, vide Manu IV. 25 'agnihotram ca juhuyāt' and XI. 53 ('caritavyam-ato &c.') as instances of the two ways. From different points of view *vidhi* is classified in various ways. One classification is into four, *Utpattividhi* (originative injunction), *Viniyogavidhi* (applicatory), prayoga *vidhi* (performance), *adhikāra-vidhi* (eligibility). Utpattividhi is one which shows in a general way the nature of the rite, as in 'agnihotram juhoti' (he offers the agnihotra oblation); an applicatory injunction is one which conveys the connexion of a subsidiary matter with the main rite as in 'dadhnā juhoti' (he offers oblation with curds) and this is dealt with in the 3rd chapter of the P. M. S.; a prayogavidhi is an injunction that governs the order of parts in a rite and suggests non-delay or promptness in the performance, though often times it is implied rather than expressly stated. This is considered in the chapters IV and V of the P. M. S. An Adhikāravidhi (injunction of qualification or eligibility) is one that points to the ownership of the fruit of an action as in 'svargakāmo yajeta' (he who desires to secure heaven should perform a yāga).[1996] This is the subject of the 6th chapter of P. M. S.

(Continued from last page)

general rule in पू. मी. सू. IV. 3. 15 'स स्वर्गः स्यात्सर्वान्प्रत्यविशिष्टत्वात्'. About such special passages Śabara remarks 'ननु वर्तमानापदेशोऽयम्। सत्यमेवमेतत्। आनर्थक्यपरिहाराय फलचोदनया सम्बन्ध एषितव्यो भवति।' on पू. मी. सू. III. 4. 24 (p. 955) and the तन्त्रवार्तिक on the same states 'सत्यपि चार्थवादस्वरूपत्वे पारार्थ्यानवधारणादेवंजातीयकेषु फलविधित्वं वक्ष्यति 'फलमात्रेयो निर्देशात्' इति।'. फलमा° is the सिद्धान्त in पू. मी. सू. IV. 3. 18 (about रात्रिसत्र).

1996. The मी. न्या. प्र. gives the following definitions 'तत्सिद्धं विधिः प्रयोजनवन्तमप्राप्तार्थं विधत्ते। तत्र कर्मस्वरूपमात्रबोधको विधिरुत्पत्तिविधिः, यथा अग्निहोत्रं जुहोतीति। अङ्गप्रधानसम्बन्धबोधको विधिर्विनियोगविधिः, यथा दध्ना जुहोतीति। ... प्रयोगप्राशुभावबोधको विधिः प्रयोगविधिः। स चाङ्गवाक्यैकतामापन्नः प्रधानविधिरेव। ... फलस्वाम्यबोधको विधिरधिकारविधिः। फलस्वाम्यं च कर्मजन्यफलभोक्तृत्वम्। स च यजेत स्वर्गकाम इत्येवंरूपः।' pp. 66, 72, 171, 193 (BORI ed. of 1937). The आश्व. गृ. (I. 2.1) prescribes 'सायं प्रातः सिद्धस्य हविष्यस्य जुहुयात्.' Here जुहुयात् is उत्पत्तिविधि, सिद्धस्य हविष्यस्य would be विनियोगविधि. The अर्थसंग्रह gives another definition of प्रयोगविधि as 'अङ्गानां क्रमबोधको विधिः प्रयोगविधिरित्यपि लक्षणम्' (p 11 text) i. e. prayogavidhi is one that conveys the order of the subsidiaries in a principal rite,

Another and an important classification is apūrva-vidhi (injunction of something quite new and not otherwise established as in 'svargakāmo yajeta'), niyamavidhi (a restrictive injunction) as in 'he pounds the rice' and parisaṅkhyāvidhi (an injunction in form where two alternatives being simultaneously possible one is precluded). The Tantravārtika defines these three in a well-known verse.[1997] For a sacrifice a plot of land is required which may be quite flat or may have ups and downs. Here there are two alternatives only and both cannot be availed of at the same time (i. e. a man cannot perform a sacrifice at the same time on even as well as on uneven ground). Therefore, 'same deśe yajeta' (one should offer a sacrifice on an even spot) is a *niyama* (it restricts the performance to flat land only) and excludes the use of uneven land for a sacrifice. 'Five five-nailed animals are to be eaten'. This is a parisaṅkhyā. This sentence is not a vidhi, as eating flesh is already established by men's appetites. Nor is it a niyama, since one can eat the flesh of five-nailed animals as well as of other animals at the same time. It is a parisaṅkhyā. i. e. it prohibits the eating of the flesh of animals other than of five five-nailed animals. In form the sentence is a vidhi (as it employs the word 'bhakṣyāḥ' (which is optative or potential passive participle), but in substance it is a prohibition of eating the flesh of animals other than the five five-nailed ones. The

---

1997. विधिरत्यन्तमप्राप्ते नियमः पाक्षिके सति। तत्र चान्यत्र च प्राप्ते परिसंख्येति कीर्त्यते॥ विधिरेव हि केनचिद्विशेषेणैवं भिद्यते। तत्र योऽत्यन्तमप्राप्तो न च प्राप्स्यति प्रागवचनादित्यवगम्यते तत्र नियोगः शुद्ध एव विधिर्यथा व्रीहीन्प्रोक्षतीति। यत्र तु प्रागवचनात् पाक्षिकी प्राप्तिः सम्भाव्यते तत्राप्राप्तिपक्षं पूरयन्यो विधिः प्रवर्तते स नियन्तृत्वान्नियम इत्युच्यते यथा व्रीहीनवहन्तीति। तन्त्रवा. on I. 2. 34 p. 152. On P. M. S. VI. 3. 16 the टुप्टीका says 'यस्त कदाचिदपि प्राप्नोति स विधिः। यथा, अग्निहोत्रं जुहुयात्—इति। पूतीकाः प्राप्नुवन्ति तस्माद्युक्तमुक्तं नियमार्थः क्वचिद्विधिः।'. 'मेधा० on मनु. III. 45 (ऋतुकालाभिगामी०) reads प्राप्तौ in both halves and परिसंख्या नास्तिश्चेव'. नास्तिश्चेव refers to the sentence पञ्च पञ्चनखा भक्ष्याः. If these words are taken as परिसंख्या the three faults are; 'पञ्च भक्ष्या इति यद्वाक्यतः पञ्चनखविषयं भक्षणं प्रतीयते तदा तत्यक्तं भवति, तद्व्यतिरिक्तनिषेधपरत्वाद्वाक्यस्य। अश्रुतश्च निषेधः, अतः परार्थकल्पना। अर्थित्वाच्च सर्वविषयभक्षणं यत्प्राप्तं तस्य बाधः' मेधा on मनु. III. 45. The sprinkling of water on rice in a rite is not established by any other means and is therefore a vidhi. Rice can be unhusked with the nails or by being pounded by the use of a mortar and pestle. Therefore 'vrīhīn avahanti' is a niyama, since it does not allow the use of nails and puts the restriction of pounding.

word pariśaṅkhyā occurs in P. M. S X. 7. 4 and 7 and Śabara notes that it is liable to three faults.[1998]

Dharmaśāstra writers make frequent use of the doctrine of *niyama* and *parisaṅkhyā*. Medhātithi on Manu III. 45 (ṛtukālābhigāmī syāt) has a long note on niyama and parisaṅkhyā, quotes the verse of Tantravārtika and explains the passage about five five-nailed animals. The Mit. also on Yāj. on I. 79 (tasmin yugmāsu saṁviśet 'the husband should approach the wife on every even night next to the 4th night up to the 16th after her monthly illness starts) and on I. 81 holds a lengthy discussion whether there is a vidhi or niyama or parisaṅkhyā. The Mit. defines the three in prose, cites examples and tells us that some thought that there was only a parisaṅkhyā, while Bhāruci, Viśvarūpa, and others (including the Mit.) hold that there is a niyamavidhi only in I. 79 and 81. Āp. Dh. S. II. 1. 17 deals with the same subject as Yāj. I. 79 and 81 and Haradatta says it is a niyama, while others thought it was a parisaṅkhyā and that in any case it is not a pure vidhi. On Gautama V. 2 Haradatta comments that the ācārya (i. e. Gautama) holds that there is a parisaṅkhyā only (the sūtra is 'sarvatra vā pratisiddhavarjam'). Compare Yāj. I. 81 (yathākāmī bhaved-vāpi &c.), on which the Mit. emphatically says that in both Gautama and Yāj. there is a restrictive rule (niyama). Gautama prescribes that a brāhmaṇa should eat at the houses of persons of the three higher classes that are commended for the performance of their duties and should receive gifts also from such persons. Haradatta treats these two rules as[1999] parisaṅkhyāvidhis. Āp. Dh. S. II. provides the rules of conduct for husband and wife after their marriage, the first being 'taking food two times (morning and evening)'. Haradatta takes it as a parisaṅkhyā, meaning that eating a third time is prohibited (but they may or may not eat twice in the day), while others take it as a *niyama* meaning 'they must eat twice in the day'.

1998. On पू. मी. सू. X. 7. 5. शबर says 'न चैतदस्ति परिसंख्येति। तत्र हि त्रयो दोषाः। स्वार्थप्रहाणं परार्थकल्पना प्राप्तबाधश्चेति.' Vide शबर on III. 7. 33 for the same words. As said in the भाट्टदीपिका 'शब्दतः फलतो वा यस्य शास्त्रस्यान्यनिवृत्तिविषयः स परिसंख्याविधिः। तत्र चान्यत्र च प्राप्तिर्न तु सापि लक्षणघटिकेति ध्येयम्।' (p. 9. B. I. ed.)

1999. क्षुदुपघातार्था भोजने प्रवृत्तिः। शक्या च यस्य कस्यचिद्गृहे भुञ्जानेन क्षुदुपहन्तुम्। तत्र परिसंख्याटे एषामेव गृहे ब्राह्मणो भुञ्जीत नान्येषामिति। हरदत्त on गौतम 17. 1; पाणिग्रहणादधि गृहमेधिनोर्व्रतम्। कालयोर्भोजनम्। आप. ध. सू. II. 1. 1. 1-2; कालयोरुभयोरपि भोजनं कर्तव्यं सायं प्रातश्च। हरदत्त (this is a नियम and not परिसंख्या).

Niyamavidhis are of three classes, viz. those concerned with *pratinidhis* (substitutes), those about *pratipatti* (concluding act or final disposal of certain materials employed in a sacrifice), and those that are concerned with matters other than the preceding two. The Tāṇḍya-brāhmaṇa says[2000] 'if one is not able to obtain the soma plant, one may extract juice from *pūtikas*'. Jai. III. 6. 40 and VI. 3. 13–17 deal with this matter and Jai. and Śabara prescribe that if no soma plant is available in a soma sacrifice, the sacrificer should substitute pūtikas for Soma and no other substance, even if the latter be more similar to Soma, can be used.[2001] The word *pratipatti* is used in several sūtras by Jai; vide IV. 2. 11, 15, 19, 22). The casting into water of all utensils and things smeared with *some* (such as the dregs left after Soma is extracted, the stones, two wooden boards and the post of udumbara in the midst of the *sadas*) at the time of the final purificatory bath (avabhṛtha) *in Jyotiṣṭoma is* said to be pratipattikarma (P. M S. IV. 2. 22). This terminology is employed in Dharmaśāstra works. Manu (III. 262–263) provides that out of the three piṇḍas (balls of boiled rice) that are offered to the three male ancestors of the performer of *śrāddha* the wife desirous of a son should eat the middle piṇḍa (meant for the paternal grandfather) and Devala provides that the piṇḍas may be given to a brāhmaṇa or may be eaten by a goat or a cow or cast into fire or water.[2002] This is the pratipatti of the piṇḍas according to Aparārka (on Yāj. I. 256) and the Sm. C. II p. 486. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV pp. 480–481. The word pratipatti is opposed to *arthakarma*. For example, in Tai. S. we read 'after the soma plant is bought, he gives the staff to the Maitrāvaruṇa priest'. Here the staff had been first given to the performer (Yajamāna) at the time of Dīkṣā and then transferred to the Maitrāvaruṇa who has several uses for it, viz. he can walk with its help in darkness, may enter water, can prevent cows and snakes from coming near him and he can

---

2000. यदि सोमं न विन्देयुः पूतीकानभिषुणुयुर्यदि न पूतीकानर्जुनानि च। ताण्ड्य IX. 5. 3.

2001. नियमार्था गुणश्रुतिः। पू. मी. सू. III. 6.40; नियमार्थः क्वचिद्विधिः। पू. मी. सू. VI. 3. 16; on which Śabara comments 'सोमाभावे बहुषु सदृशेषु प्राप्तेषु नियमः क्रियते। पूतिका अभिषोतव्या इति। तस्मात्प्रतिनिधिमुपादाय प्रयोगः कर्तव्य इति।'.

2002. तेन पत्नीप्राशिते मध्यमपिण्डे पिण्डद्वयस्यापि प्रतिपत्तिः कार्या। अपरार्क p. 550. (quotes मत्स्य 16. 52–53 which are similar to याज्ञ. I. 256).

support himself on it. So this is different from pratipatti, where the substance is finally disposed of and no further use is made of it. This is dealt with in P. M. S. IV. 2. 16–18. This (giving of the staff) is *arthakarma* as opposed to pratipatti-karma. This is mentioned in Tai. S. VI. 1. 4. 2 (krite some maitrāvaruṇāya daṇḍam prayacchati &c.). Another example of pratipatti is the casting of the horn of the black antelope on the *cātvāla* (Tai. S. VI. I. 3. 8 and PMS IV. 2. 19). PMS XI. 2. 66–68 deal with an example of arthakarma. Cremating a sacrificer when dead with his implements of sacrifice (mentioned in Tai. S. I. 6. 8. 2–3) is pratipattikarma of the implements (P. M. S. XI. 3. 34). Manu V. 167 provides that if the wife of an *āhitāgni* dies before him she is to be cremated with the sacred fires set up by him and with the sacrificial implements. An example of the third kind of niyama (which is not concerned with pratinidhi or pratipatti) is 'one should take his meal,[2003] facing the east'. A man can take food facing any direction but this restricts him to the east alone. Here no question of a pratinidhi or of pratipatti arisess.

Vidhis are also divided into *Kratvartha* (for the rite) and *Puruṣārtha* (for the man) They are concerned with 'Prayukti'. (motivating force) which is the subject of chapter IV of the P.M. S. P. M. S. IV. 1. 2 defines [2004] *puruṣārtha* and Śabara advances three interpretations of that sūtra, one of which is '(Puruṣārtha) is that matter on doing which follows the happiness of man, as its understanding is due to man's desire for obtaining it (happiness) and puruṣārtha (man's purpose) is not different (from happiness)'. From this rather obscure and clumsy definition it appears to follow that puruṣārtha is what a man ordinarily undertakes for securing the reward of happiness, while kratvartha is that which helps in the accomplishment of purūṣārtha and does not itself directly yield any reward to the performer. All principal sacrifices like Darśa-pūrṇamāsa are included under puruṣārtha, while under kratvartha are put all those auxiliary acts that have the

---

2003. प्राङ्मुखोऽन्नानि भुञ्जीत — occurs in आप. ध. सू. I. 11. 31. 1.

2004. 'यस्मिन्प्रीतिः पुरुषस्य तस्य लिप्सार्थलक्षणाऽविभक्तत्वात्।' पू. मी. सू. IV. 1. 2. The meaning of the sūtra as given by मयूखमालिका on शास्त्रदीपिका is 'यस्मिन् पदार्थे कृते पुरुषस्य प्रीतिः स्वर्गादिलक्षणोपजायते स दर्शपूर्णमासादिः पुरुषार्थः यतस्तस्य लिप्सा अनुष्ठानं अर्थलक्षणं पुरुषार्थस्य प्रीत्या अविभक्तत्वात्।'. The words of the sūtra are underlined in this explanation. लिप्सा is a desiderative noun from the root 'labh' (to get) and means लब्धुमिच्छा. The मिता. on या. II. 114, therefore, calls it लिप्सासूत्र.

purpose of accomplishing the principal rite itself e. g. the five [2005] *prayājas* that are auxiliary to the Darśapūrṇamāsa are Kratvartha, while Darśapūrṇamāsa itself is puruṣārtha. The importance of this distinction lies in this that if what is kratvartha is not followed the rite itself becomes defective, while if what is puruṣārtha is not followed, the result is that the man himself becomes blamable or sinful but the undertaking or rite does not become defective. One set of the three interpretations of P. M. S. IV. 1. 2 given by Śabara is that it refers to the rules about the acquisition of wealth viz. that a brāhmaṇa should earn wealth by receiving gifts, a kṣatriya by conquest and a vaiśya by agriculture and the like (vide Gaut. X. 40-42, Manu X. 76-79). These are in the nature of niyamas. If the acquisition of wealth is kratvartha and, if one acquires wealth by means other than those prescribed by the Śāstra and performs a sacrifice with such wealth, the sacrifice itself would be defective and would not yield the desired reward. But if the acquisition of wealth be puruṣārtha, then, by whatever means wealth with which a *yāga* is to be performed be obtained, the sacrifice would not be affected. The Mit. on [2006] Yaj. II. 114 quotes a passage from Guru Prabhākara (vide note 1947) which is quoted by the Dāyabhāga also (II. 67) but without name, while the Sm. C. II. pp. 257-58), Madanaratna (on Vyavahāra pp. 324-325) and Vyavahāraprakāśa (p. 420) quote a similar passage from the Nayaviveka. Viśvarūpa also on Yāj. II. 144 holds that rules about acquisition of wealth are 'puruṣārtha'. To acquire wealth is natural to man and acquisition of wealth does not depend upon Śāstra. Besides, every one can directly perceive that wealth when earned confers pleasure on the acquirer. Therefore, wealth is puruṣārtha and sacrifices which are performed with wealth are also puruṣārtha. The general rule is that all aṅgas (auxiliary rites) are kratvartha and all principal rites (like

---

2005. The Tai. S. III. 6. 1. 1 mentions five *prayājas* (oblations of clarified butter) introductory to the principal offerings of Darśapūrṇamāsa viz. 'Samidho yajati, tanūnapātam yajati, iḍo yajati, barhir-yajati, svāhākāram yajati.' There is a difference of view as to whether these are names of rites or of devatās. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II p. 1057 note 2361.

2006. The मिता० explains 'यदा द्रव्यार्जननियमानां क्रत्वर्थत्वं तदा नियमार्जितेनैव द्रव्येण क्रतुसिद्धिर्न नियमातिक्रमार्जितेन द्रव्येणेति न पुरुषस्य नियमातिक्रमदोषः पूर्वपक्षे। सिद्धान्ते त्वर्जननियमस्य पुरुषार्थत्वात्तदतिक्रमेणार्जितेनापि द्रव्येण क्रतुसिद्धिर्भवति, पुरुषस्यैव नियमातिक्रमदोष इति नियमातिक्रमार्जितस्यापि स्वत्वमङ्गीकृतम्। अन्यथा क्रतुसिद्ध्यभावात्।' Intro. to या. II. 114.

Darśapūrṇamāsa, Somayāga) are puruṣārtha; all texts prescribing the rewards of rites are puruṣārtha. Some individual examples may be given.

In the Śāṅkhāyana Br. (VI. 6) after saying that certain observances (*vrata*) must be followed by the sacrificer, it is provided that he should not see the sun rising or setting. These observances are called 'Prajāpativratāni' by Śabara and are declared by him to be puruṣārtha, the meaning being that the sacrificer should make a resolve not to see the rising or setting sun.

This distinction between Kratvartha and Puruṣārtha is often taken over into Dharmaśāstra matters. For example, Yāj. I. 53 provides that one should marry a girl who is free from diseases, has a brother and who does not belong to the same *gotra* or *pravara* as that of the bridegroom. The Mit.[2007] explains that the status of being a wife does not at all arise if the girl is a *sapiṇḍa* or is of the same *gotra* or *pravara* as the bridegroom (i. e. marriage itself is null and void), but a girl who has some disease when married becomes a wife, the only result being that there is a visible defect (such as a diseased wife is a constant source of anxiety and unhappiness). Kullūka on Manu III. 7 (providing that one should not marry a girl from a family in which prevail diseases like phthisis, epilepsy, white and black leprosy, refers to this doctrine of Śabara elaborated above. The Mit. on Yāj. III. 280 quotes a verse 'a wise man should not marry a girl who has no brother, nor father, for fear that she may be a *putrikā* (daughter appointed as a son).' Here the prohibition is like the prohibition of marrying a deformed girl i. e. it is a perceptible purpose. Therefore, the marriage would be valid i. e. the prohibition is puruṣārtha.' Manu says (IX. 168) 'that is known to be an adopted son whom the mother or father might give (to another) with water in a time of distress &c.'. The Mit. on Yaj. II. 130 quotes this verse and remarks that, as the word 'distress' is specifically mentioned, a son is not to be given in adoption to another when there is no distress and that this prohibition would affect only the giver (but not the act of adoption) i. e. this prohibition would be

2007. सपिण्डा-समानगोत्रा-समानप्रवरासु भार्यात्वमेव नोत्पद्यते रोगिण्यादिषु तु भार्यात्वे उत्पन्नेऽपि दृष्टविरोध एव। मिता. on या. I. 53 ; this means that the provision against marrying a sapiṇḍa, sagotra or sapravara girl is क्रत्वर्थ, while that about not marrying a diseased girl is only पुरुषार्थ.

puruṣārtha and not kratvartha.[2008] It may be noted that the Vyavahāramayūkha disagrees and holds that the prohibition is kratvartha. It may be said in a general way that those prescriptions that have an invisible, spiritual or other-worldly result or reward are kratvartha, while those that have a visible result are puruṣārtha.

Before proceeding further it is necessary to analyse the notions underlying the word 'yajeta' used in such Vedic sentences as 'one desiring heaven should offer a sacrifice' (svargakāmo yajeta). In the word 'yajeta'[2009] there are two parts viz. the root 'yaj' (to sacrifice) and the termination (of injunctive third person singular). In the termination also there are two parts (elements) viz. general verbal nature and injunctiveness (or injunctive force). General verbal nature is found in the ten *lakāras* (verbal forms in ten moods and tenses), but injunctiveness is found only in the injunctive form. Both general verbal nature and injunctiveness express only *bhāvanā* (force that brings into being something, efficient force). Bhāvanā (lit.) means a particular operation or activity of an agent which conduces to the coming into being of the result (lit. which is to come into being). And this bhāvanā is of two kinds, *śābdī* (word force) and *ārthī* (result-producing force).

It has been already stated that vidhis are the very core of the Veda. The doctrine of bhāvanā is the very heart of vidhis and is therefore one of the most important doctrines of the mīmāṁsā.

In ordinary life when a person says to another 'this should be done by you', the prompting to do something comes from a person. But Veda has according to the Mīmāṁsā no author, human or divine. Therefore, in a Vedic vidhi the prompting arises from the injunctive or the optative form of the word; there is no person, human of divine, behind the injunction; hence the bhāvanā is said to be śābdī (i. e. based on the word itself and not on the will or direction of a person). There-

---

2008. आपद्ग्रहणादनापदि न देयः। दातुरयं प्रतिषेधः। मिता. on या. II. 130; the व्य. म. p. 107 disagrees: अयं निषेधो दातुरेव पुरुषार्थः, न क्रत्वर्थ इति विज्ञानेश्वरः। तन्न। अस्य वाक्यादृष्टार्थतया क्रत्वर्थावगमात्।'.

2009. यथाहि यजेतेत्यत्रास्त्यंशद्वयम्, यजिधातुः प्रत्ययश्च। तत्र प्रत्ययेऽप्यस्त्यंशद्वयम्, आख्यातत्वं लिङ्त्वं च। आख्यातत्वं च दशसु लकारेषु विद्यते। लिङ्त्वं च पुनः केवलं लिङ्येव। तत्राख्यातत्वलिङ्त्वाभ्यां भावनैवोच्यते। भावना नाम भवितुर्भवनानुकूलो भावकव्यापारविशेषः। सा च द्विविधा शाब्दी भावना, आर्थी भावना चेति। मी. न्या. प्र. pp. 4–6 (BORI ed.).

fore, śābdī-bhāvanā is defined as a particular operation (or activity) of an agent (here the word of the Veda) that conduces to the activity of a man; and it is expressed by that part or element which is optative. It is called 'śābdī' because it is 'śabdaniṣṭha (centred in the word of the Veda) and not puruṣaniṣṭha (centred in a person). In a śābdībhāvanā there are three elements viz. (1) there is prompting of the agent to activity, (2) the injunction is the instrument and (3) the manner is furnished by the desirableness proclaimed by arthavāda passages. The śābdī-bhāvanā gives rise to ārthī-bhāvanā. In an ārthī-bhāvanā (that aims at or seeks the artha, the *phala*) also there are three elements viz. (1) svarga is the *phala* that is to be brought about, (2) the means or instrument is yāga, (3) there is also the procedure or method (itikartavyatā) of the yāga. All this is based on the P. M. S. sūtra II. 1. 1, on Śabara's bhāṣya and certain important verses of the Tantravārtika quoted below. This whole discussion leads on to the idea of *apūrva.* Yāga lasts for a short time, while svarga comes to a man after death, which may be years after the performance of the sacrifice. What is the connecting link between yāga and svarga (the cause and the result)? It is the force or potency generated by yāga that brings about svarga.

Briefly, the idea is; both the root and the affix together express the sense of the affix and as the bhāvanā is the principal element in this, it is held to be the sense of the affix. There are numerous [2010] 'bhāvaśabdas' such as yajati, juhoti, dadāti,

---

2010. भावार्थाः कर्मशब्दास्तेभ्यः क्रिया प्रतीयेतैष ह्यर्थो विधीयते । पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 1; in the मयूखमालिका on शास्त्रदीपिका this is explained as follows: भावार्थाः भावनाप्रयोजकाः ये कर्मशब्दाः धातवस्तेभ्योऽपूर्वं प्रतीयेत एष हि धात्वर्थः पदश्रुत्या भावनाकरणत्वेन विधीयते. कर्मशब्दाः means कर्मप्रतिपादकाः. कः पुनर्भावः के ते पुनर्भावशब्दा इति। यजति ददाति जुहोत्येवमादयः।...यजेतेत्येवमादयः साकाङ्क्षा यजेत किं केन कथमिति स्वर्गकाम इत्येतेन प्रयोजनेन निराकाङ्क्षाः। शबर (q. above in note 1962); अभिधाभावनामाहुरन्यामेव लिङादयः। अर्थात्मभावना त्वन्या सर्वाख्यातेषु गम्यते। तन्त्रवा. p. 378; शास्त्रे तु सर्वत्र प्रत्ययार्थो भावनेति व्यवहारः। तत्रायमभिप्रायः। प्रत्ययार्थं सह ब्रूतः प्रकृतिप्रत्ययौ सदा। प्राधान्याद्भावना तेन प्रत्ययार्थोऽवधार्यते॥ तन्त्रवा. p. 380. The महाभाष्य on वार्तिक 2 on पा. III. 1. 67 has the maxim प्रकृतिप्रत्ययौ प्रत्ययार्थं सह ब्रूतः and शबर refers to it as आचार्योपदेश on III. 4. 13 p. 922. Pāṇini coins special technical names for tenses and moods and does not employ words expressive of meaning, present, past or future. They begin with ल and therefore are called लकारs. They are: लट् (वर्तमान, present); लेट् (Vedic subjunctive), लिट् (परोक्षे लिट्, perfect), लुङ् (Aorist), लङ् (अनद्यतनभूत Imperfect), लिङ् (optative, पा. III. 3. 161, 173), लोट् (blessing or prayer, पा. III. 1. 173), लुट् (distant future in

(*Continued on next page*)

dogdhi, pinaṣṭi. These are of two sorts, viz. pradhāna (principal) and guṇabhūta.[2012] Those by which a substance is not intended to be produced or embellished (or made fit) for a religious rite, are expressive of principal karma (such as prayājas), while those which are meant to produce a substance or to make a substance fit are *guṇabhūta* (such as pounding rice grains or chiselling a piece of wood for making a sacrificial post, wiping *sruc* ladle). Therefore the latter kind of actions are called guṇakarma. There are two kinds of verbal forms (1) those in which the form only conveys that the *kartā* (doer of the action) exists such as the forms 'asti, bhavati, vidyate'; (2) there are others where not only there is the existence of the *kartā* but there is also the understanding of some activity that produces a result such as 'yajati' (meaning 'yāgam karoti'), 'dadāti' (i. e. dānam karoti), 'pacati' (pākam karoti), 'gacchati' i. e. gamanam karoti). That is, in such cases the sense of *karoti* is also understood. Jaimini (in P. M. S. II. 1. 4) divides words into two classes viz. *Nāmāni* (nouns) and *Karmaśabdāḥ* (verbs). Under the first Śabara would include pronouns and adjectives. The 2nd is called 'ākhyāta'. Śabara (on II. 1. 3.) paraphrases (nāmāni as 'dravya-guṇaśabdāḥ' and remarks that in the sūtra (II. 1. 3) the word 'nāmāni' is employed in the sense of dravyaguṇaśabdāḥ'[2013]. Śabara remarks that *dhātvartha* (the

---

(Continued from last page)

ता), लृट् (future in स्य), लृङ् (conditional). The words भावार्थाः कर्मशब्दाः echo the निरुक्त I. 1 भावप्रधानमाख्यातम्.

2011 ननु केयं शाब्दी भावना। उच्यते पुरुषप्रवृत्त्यनुकूलो व्यापारविशेषः। स एव विध्यर्थः (i. e. विधिशब्दार्थः)। लिङादिश्रवणेऽयं मां प्रवर्तयतीति नियमेन प्रतीतेः। मी. न्या. प्र. p. 267 (BORI ed.) and अतश्च शब्दनिष्ठ एव प्रेरणापरपर्यायो व्यापारः शाब्दी भावना। मी. न्या. प्र. p. 269; स्वर्गेच्छाजनितो यागविषयो यः प्रयत्नः स भावना (आर्थी) स एव चाख्यातांशेनोच्यते। यजेतेत्याख्यातश्रवणे यागेन यजेतेति प्रतीतेर्जायमानत्वात्। मी. न्या. प्र p. 274. Vide तन्त्रवार्तिक pp. 376–377.

2012. तानि द्वैधं गुणप्रधानभूतानि। यैर्द्रव्यं न चिकीर्ष्यते तानि प्रधानभूतानि द्रव्यस्य गुणभूतत्वात्। यैस्तु द्रव्यं चिकीर्ष्यते गुणस्तत्र प्रतीयेत तस्य द्रव्यप्रधानत्वात्। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 6–8 and शबर thereon; विहिते कर्मणि तदङ्गतया द्रव्यदेवतादिविधायकं वाक्यं गुणवाक्यं दध्ना जुहुयादिति। मी. परिभाषा p. 2.

2013. येषां शब्दानामुच्चारणोत्पत्तौ स्वेऽर्थे प्रयुज्यमानानां रूपमुपलभ्यते। यत् सकृदुत्पन्नं कालान्तरं तिष्ठति न क्रियेवोत्पन्नमात्रं विनश्यतीत्यर्थः। तानि नामानि। ते द्रव्यगुणशब्दाः। ईदृशो द्रव्यगुणशब्दानामर्थः। ते द्रव्यगुणशब्दा इति वक्तव्ये तानि नामानीति सूत्रितम्। अतो नामानीत्येषां पर्यायशब्दः। शबर on पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 3. When we say पाकः it is a nāman and denotes an accomplished fact, while when one says 'pacati' it is not one accomplished fact but includes from beginning to end several acts, such as preparing fire, placing on it a pot containing water, putting rice

(Continued on next page)

meaning of a verbal root) can have no ākāṅkṣā (expectancy) for Dharmas but it is the pratyayārtha that has ākāṅkṣā for the procedure (itikartavyatā).

We must now turn to the 2nd great division of Vedic texts, viz. Arthavādas. They are dealt with in P. M. S. first adhyāya, 2nd pāda. There are numerous Vedic passages such as 'he roared; because he roared he came to be called Rudra' (Tai. S. I. 5. 1. 1.), 'Prajāpati cut out his own fat' (Tai. S. II. 1. 1. 4), 'the gods, having reached the sacrificial ground, did not know the directions' (Tai. S. VI. 1. 5. 1.); 'who knows whether one lives in the other world cr not '(Tai. S. VI. I. 1. 1.); 'there should be no piling of fire altar on the earth nor in the sky nor in heaven' (Tai. S. V. 2.7.1). The objector says 'you have yourself declared that enjoining religious rites is the purpose of the Veda' (P. M. S. I. 1. 2). The above and similar passages do not serve any purpose in the matter of religious acts, they are therefore useless and are non-eternal (or do not refer to any permanent matter). The reply is that these passages form one syntactical or connected whole with hortatory passages of the Veda and they serve the purpose of commending (or glorifying) the hortatory passages. Śabara cites on I. 2. 7 the passage 'one desiring prosperity should sacrifice a white animal in honour of Vāyu; Vāyu indeed is the swiftest deity; he runs near Vāyu with the share proper (to Vāyu); he (Vāyu) leads the sacrificer to prosperity'.[2014] These words form one whole passage; the first

---

(*Continued from last page*)

grains therein when the water is boiling, stirring it and taking it down from the fire. The निरुक्त says 'भावप्रधानमाख्यातम् सत्त्वप्रधानानि नामानि ... पूर्वापरीभूतं भावमाख्यातेनाचष्टे व्रजति पचतीति उपक्रमप्रभृत्यपवर्गपर्यन्तम्॥' (I. 1.). शबर also follows this 'एवं तस्याख्यातस्यार्थमुपदिशन्ति, उपक्रमप्रभृत्यपवर्गपर्यन्तमाहेति। उपक्रमादारभ्य यावत्परिसमाप्तिरित्येतावान् व्यापारविशेषस्तस्यार्थो न यथा पाकः, त्यागः इति। तत्र हि पाकसत्तामात्रं निर्दिश्यते नास्य परिसमापयितव्यमिति।' on पू. मी. सू. VI. 2. 13; न हि धात्वर्थस्य च धर्माणां च परस्परेणाकांक्षा विद्यते, प्रत्ययार्थेन हीतिकर्तव्यताकांक्ष्यते कर्तव्यं कथमिति न यजिः कीदृश इति। तस्माद्यत्कर्तव्यं तस्यैवेतिकर्तव्यतया सम्बन्धः। अपूर्वं च तत्। तस्मादपूर्वप्रयुक्ता इति। शबर on पू. मी. सू. IX. 1. 1 p. 1639.

2014. आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वादानर्थक्यमतदर्थानां तस्मादनित्यमुच्यते (पूर्वपक्ष)। विधिना त्वेकवाक्यत्वात्स्तुत्यर्थेन विधीनां स्युः। पू. मी. सू. I. 2. 1 and 7. The passage quoted on I. 2. 7 is 'वायव्यं श्वेतमालभेत भूतिकामः। वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवता वायुमेव स्वेन भागधेयेनोपधावति। स एवैनं भूतिं गमयति।' This अर्थवाद (वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवता) is an auxiliary (शेष) to the विधि 'वायव्य... लभेत' etc.; this occurs in तै. सं. II. 1.1.1. The भाष्य on I. 2. 10 (गुणवादस्तु) points out the passages of which the three passages cited under I. 2. 1 are अर्थवाद्s. For example, the passage 'सोऽरोदीद्यदरोदीत-

(*Continued on next page*)

part 'vāyavyam...bhūtikāmaḥ' is clearly a vidhi, as the word 'ālabheta (in the optative form) shows. The latter portion is an arthavāda for the purpose of commendation. People are familiar with the fact that Vāyu is swift. Therefore, the latter portion (Vāyurvai &c.) merely repeats what is already well known (that is, it is an anuvāda). In sūtras 19–25 of I. 2 the P. M. S. considers certain passages that look like vidhis but are declared to be arthavādas. For example, (Tai. S. II. 1. 1. 6) 'the sacrificial post is to be of udumbara wood; the udumbara wood is indeed vigour (or food or sap); cattle are vigour; by this strong (or juicy) post, he (sacrificer) secures cattle, for 'the securing of strength'. The objector says that this is a *phalavidhi* (an injunctive text about a result) as the words 'ūrjoऽvaruddhyai' contain the purpose and there is no word of commendation. The reply is that there is only commendation.

There are some passages in the Veda in which occur words like 'hi' (because) such as in 'one should offer into fire the oblation with the winnowing basket, because food is prepared by means of it' (Tai. Br. I. 6. 5).[2015] The question that arises is

---

(Continued from last page)

रुद्रस्य रुद्रत्वम्' is an अर्थवाद of 'बर्हिषि रजतं न देयं।' तै. सं. I. 5. 1. 1–2. This arthavāda (सोऽरोदीत् etc.) *is an auxiliary* (शेष) *to the* प्रतिषेध 'बर्हिषि रजतं न देयम्. The word अनित्य in the sūtra is purposely used. Veda is nitya and therefore pramāṇa. Hence the passages not referring to any religious rite are different from the portion dealing with rites and anitya i. e. apramāṇa (not authoritative). Vide p. 927 note 1482 about calling पुराणs as merely arthavādas.

2015. हेतुर्वा स्यादर्थवत्त्वोपपत्तिभ्याम्। स्तुतिस्तु शब्दपूर्वत्वादचोदना च तस्य। पू. मी. सू. I. 2. 26–27; अथ ये हेतुवन्निगदाः शूर्पेण जुहोति तेन ह्यन्नं क्रियत इत्येवमादयः। तेषु सन्देहः। किं स्तुतिस्तेषां कार्यमुत हेतुरिति।; अस्मत्पक्षे पुनः शूर्पं स्तूयते। तेन ह्यन्नं क्रियत इति वृत्तान्तान्वाख्यानं न च वृत्तान्तज्ञापनाय किं तर्हि प्ररोचनायैव। तस्माद्धेतुवन्निगदस्यापि स्तुतिरेव कार्यमिति। शबर on I. 2. 30. शूर्प was used like a *juhu* ladle to make a homa of Karambhapātras (pots full of husked grains of yava slightly fried, ground and mixed with curds) in the Varuṇapraghāsa, one of the cāturmāsyas. The position of the P. M. S. is that what Veda declares is authoritative; there is no need to cite reasons for the statements of the Veda. It may cite a reason for its declaration, even though no necessity exists. As stated by the Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi "अनेन वेदविहितेऽर्थे हेत्वपेक्षा नास्तीति पार्थसारथिप्रतिपादितानपेक्षत्वं हेतुवादस्येति सूचितम्। उक्तं च 'न हि वेदेनोच्यमानं हेतुमपेक्षते' इति॥". Vide for a detailed discussion of this हेतुवन्निगदाधिकरण in connection with the rule of Vasiṣṭha 15. 3–4 (na tvekam putram dadyāt pratigṛhṇīyādvā, sa hi santānāya pūrveṣām) in H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 676–77 n, 1277. Here the first is a vidhi, 'dadyāt' and 'pratigṛhṇīyāt' being in the optative mood,

(Continued on next page)

whether this and other passages containing words denoting reason should be construed as arthavādas commending what is enjoined in the preceding sentence or whether as stating a reason for the injunction. The established conclusion is that they are commendatory. If the other view were adopted (viz. that śruti gives a reason for the vidhi) then it may be argued that the ladle, pan and other utensils also may be used for making an offering (not merely the śūrpa), as they also are required in preparing food. Raghunandana in Malamāsatattva p. 760 relies upon and explains this maxim with reference to Laghu-Hārīta's words ' cakravat parivarteta sūryaḥ kālavaśād yataḥ '. It should not be supposed that commendation (*stuti*) is the purpose of all arthavādas. In ' he lays down anointed pebbles, ghee is indeed brilliance ' (Tai. Br. III. 2. 5. 12) a doubt arises about the material with which pebbles are to be anointed. That doubt is removed by the remainder of the passage that it is ghee with which they are to be anointed (P. M. S. I. 4. 24)

Arthavādas are of three kinds viz. guṇavāda, anuvāda and bhūtārthavāda; ' when an arthavāda text is in conflict with ordinary experience it is metaphorical; when something is definitely ascertained by other means of knowledge and becomes the subject of a text it is called anuvāda and when a text is not opposed to other pramāṇas or is not definitely ascertained otherwise, it is called ' bhūtārthavāda ' (statement of an accomplished fact, or of a past event); in this way arthavāda is of three kinds '.[2016] An example of the first kind is ' during day-time

---

(*Continued from last page*)

while the latter part containing a reason (in ' sa hi &c. ') is on arthavāda, lauding the importance of a son). This topic of Hetuvan-nigadādhikaraṇa figured very much in the case of *Beni Prasad* vs. *Hardai Bibi* I. L. R. 14 All 67 (F. B.). The court was misled on two points, by counsel as to the first and by Mandlik's wrong statement (in 'Hindu law' p. 499) as to the 2nd. viz. that Jaimini flourished in the 13th century A. D. and secondly (p. 73, 125) ' it is a rule of the Pūrvamīmāṃsā that all texts supported by the assigniing of a reason are to be deemed not as vidhis but simply as arthavādas (recommendatory)'. This case went up to the Privy Council as *Radha Mohan* vs. *Hardai Bibi* L.R. 26 I. A. p. 153, where the Privy Council was more cautious and did not accept in its entirety the wrong statement of Mandlik.

2016. निरुक्त 1. 16 speaks of उदितानुवाद: स भवति. विरोधे गुणवाद: स्यादनु-वादोऽवधारिते। भूतार्थवादस्तद्धानादर्थवादस्त्रिधा मत:॥ q. by मी. न्या. प्र. p. 48; अनु-वादोऽवधारित इत्यस्योदाहरणं तु व्रसिंहाश्रमैरुक्तम्। अग्निर्हिमस्य भेषजम्-इति। तत्स्वाध्याया-

(*Continued on next page*)

only the smoke of fire is seen and not its flame' (this is Tai. Br. II. 1. 2. 10). One sees both smoke and fire during the day and night. What this text desires to emphasize is that by day the light of fire is not so well seen as at night (or not well seen from a distance by day as at night).

'Fire is the medicine (antidote) for cold' (Vāj. S. 23. 10 and Tai. S. VII. 4. 18. 2) is cited by some as an example of anuvāda. The M. B. P. finds fault with this on the ground that it is well-known as a mantra and does not form part of a vidhi by syntactical relation, and that it is cited by Nṛsiṁhāśrama as an example owing to neglect of the study of the Veda or absent-mindedness. A proper example would be 'Vāyu indeed is the swiftest deity' cited above. 'Prajāpati cut off his own fat' is cited by some as an example of bhūtārthavāda, but the M. B. P. does not approve of it and cites the verse 'yan-na duḥkhena sambhinnam' (cited above in note 1969) as an example.

The Mīmāṁsāparibhāṣā of Kṛṣṇayajvan classifies Arthavādas into four kinds, viz. nindā (censure), stuti (praise),' *parakṛti* (performance by another great person) and *purākalpa* (what

---

(Continued from last page)

ध्ययनवैधुर्याद् वैचित्त्याद्वा। मी. बा. प्र. p. 48. It may be noted that मधुसूदन-सरस्वती in प्रस्थानभेद, अर्थसंग्रह (p. 26, Thibaut) and M. M. Jha cited this very text as an anuvāda (in 'Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā in its sources' p 201). A strict definition of अनुवाद is 'स नामानुवादो भवति योऽत्यन्तसमानार्थत्वेनावधार्यते।' (तन्त्रवा॰ p. 911 on II. 4. 13). Medhātithi on Manu II. 227 (=Matsya 211. 22) saying that a man cannot requite even in a hundred years the parents for the troubles they undergo in the birth and upbringing of the child holds that it is a भूतार्थानुवाद. मधुसूदनसरस्वती in प्रस्थानभेद and अर्थसंग्रह (p. 26) cites इन्द्रो वृत्राय वज्रमुदयच्छत् as an example of भूतार्थवाद, and अर्थसंग्रह defines it as 'प्रमाणान्तर-विरोध-तत्प्राप्तिरहितार्थबोधको वादो भूतार्थवादः'. When the Tai. S. I. 7. 4. 4. or II. 6. 5. 3 says 'yajamānaḥ prastaraḥ' or 'yajamānaḥ yūpaḥ' the literal meaning is opposed to our perception (there is pratyakṣavirodha), therefore the sentence has to be understood in a metaphorical sense' (as when a boy is called 'fire') and is therefore a गुणवाद, that is, the meaning in 'yajamānaḥ yūpaḥ' is that he stands up (or erect) like a sacrificial post and looks brilliant. Where a statement (not being a vidhi) is neither an anuvāda nor a guṇavāda it is called vidyamānavāda or bhūtārthavāda. This is lucidly explained by Śabara in P. M. S. I. 4. 23 and by Śaṅkarācārya on Vedāntasūtra I. 3. 33. The first handful of darbha grass cut is called 'prastara'. These passages have to be interpreted in such a way as to avoid conflict with perception and other pramāṇas but also as intended to convey praise (of some vidhi already expressed). Vide भामती 'न च आदित्यो वै यूप इति वाक्यमादित्यस्य यूपत्वप्रतिपादनपरम्, अपि तु यूपस्तुतिपरम्'. The गुण stressed is तेजस्विता (brilliance) since the post is smeared with घृत.

happened in bygone ages).[2016] Devala states that sages have laid down expiation for the first wrong, for committing a second double of that, for committing a third time thrice as much but there is no expiation for committing it a fourth time. The Prāyaścitta-prakaraṇa of Bhavadeva says that this is not to be taken literally, but it is only nindārthavāda. The P. M. S. itself (VI. 7. 26 and 30) states that parakṛti and purākalpa are arthavādas.

The Vyavahāra-mayūkha quotes a verse of Devala[2017] 'on the father's death the sons should divide the paternal wealth, for they have no ownership as long as the father who suffers from no blemish (that deprive him of ownership) is alive'. Here the first half lays down a time for partition (it is a vidhi), the latter half is only an arthavāda praising the vidhi and means that, as long as the father is alive, the sons are not independent and not that they have no ownership in ancestral property.

Smṛtis also abound in arthavādas. For example, Medhātithi on Manu V. 56 (na māṁsabhakṣaṇe doṣaḥ) says that from V. 28 up to V. 56 all verses except two or three are arthavādas. Medhātithi points out in several other places in the Manusmṛti a few vidhis and numerous arthavādas. For example, Manu II. 117 contains a vidhi about *abhivādana*, while verses II.

2016. स (अर्थवादः) च चतुर्विधः निन्दा-प्रशंसा-परकृति-पुराकल्पभेदात्। ...परेण महता पुरुषेणेदं कर्म कृतमिति प्रतिपादकोऽर्थवादः परकृतिः- यथा अग्निर्वा अकामयत- इत्यादिः। परमवक्तकार्यादिप्रतिपादकः पुराकल्पः- यथा तमशपद्धिया धिया त्वा वध्यासुः- इत्यादिः। मी० परि. pp 27-28. On मनु II. 151 where an Āṅgirasa taught his pitṛs and is said to have called them 'putrakāḥ' मेधातिथि remarks 'पूर्वस्य पितृवत्स्तुतिविधेरर्थवादोऽयं परकृतिनामा.' The वायुपुराण (59.134-137) defines विधि, स्तुति, निन्दा, परकृति and पुराकल्प. The same four are said to be the constituents of अर्थवाद in न्यायसूत्र II 1. 65. परकृतिपुराकल्पं च मनुष्यधर्मः स्यादर्थाय ह्यनुकीर्तनम्। ... अर्थवादो वा विधिशेषत्वात्तस्मान्नित्यानुवादः स्यात्। पू. मी. सू. VI. 7. 26 and 30. The story of Śunaḥśepa whom his father sold to Hariścandra's son and was willing even to kill him as offering to Varuṇa (narrated in the Ait. Br.) is really an अर्थवाद of the परकृति type. Vide मनु X. 105 where this legend is mentioned and मेधा० thereon.

2017. यत्तु देवलः- पितर्युपरते पुत्रा विभजेयुर्धनं पितुः। अस्वाम्यं हि भवेदेषां निर्दोषे पितरि स्थिते- तत्र पूर्वार्धे तावद्विभागकालविधायकं विधिप्रत्ययश्रवणात्, उत्तरार्धे तु तस्यैव स्तुत्यर्थतयाऽस्वातन्त्र्यपरं न तु स्वत्वाभावपरम्। व्य. म. p. 90. The व्य. म. extends this to a sūtra of Śaṅkha which forbids partition by sons during the father's life-time even of property earned by them after they are born and states that they have no independence as regards wealth and religious ceremonies during the father's life and that the words about absence of independence are only an arthavāda eulogising the prohibition about non-division.

118-121 are arthavādas in relation to it. In Manu II. 165 a vidhi is laid down for the study of the whole Veda by persons of the three upper classes; when Manu (X. I) again lays down that the three classes should study the Veda, this is merely an anuvāda. Medhātithi on Manu. IX. 135 remarks that many verses in Manu contain arthavādas.

The Vasiṣṭha-dharmasūtra and Viṣṇudharmottara[2018] provide that cow's urine, excreta, milk, curds, clarified butter, water in which *kuśas* have been dipped and a fast for a day and night will purify even a *śvapāka*. A Śvapāka was the lowest amongst untouchables and followed the same avocations as a cāṇḍāla and was governed by the same rules (vide Manu X. 51-56). This verse is not to be taken literally, as nothing could make a cāṇḍāla touchable. Therefore, this is a mere arthavāda meant to praise the purifying effects of *pañcagavya* and a fast.

It would have been noticed that every Vedic passage is not of the nature of a vidhi (of an injunctive or exhortatory character). There are numerous Vedic passages that are commendatory of a vidhi, condemn an act that is prohibited, give an illustration of some one having performed the vidhi in the past or put forward an easily understood reason for the specific act which is enjoined. These commendatory, condemnatory and illustrative passages are not to be treated as unnecessary or purposeless, but are to be taken along with the *vidhi* passages to complete their full import. This doctrine of arthavādas saves a huge portion of Vedic texts from being neglected or treated as unnecessary.

The Garuḍapurāṇa states 'Gāndhārī, who observed a fast on Ekādaśī mixed with daśamī, lost her hundred sons; therefore Ekādaśī mixed with daśamī should be given up'. Here the first part is only a nindānuvāda (i. e. it indirectly supports the positive rule 'tām parivarjayet'), as the maxim is that '*nindā* in a text is not meant for the mere sake of condemnation but for prescribing the opposite of what is condemned.' Vide.Kṛtyaratnākara p. 635 for this interpretation. The M. B. P. (pp. 50-58) gives another classification of arthavādas into 38 varieties. They are passed over here from considerations of space.

The arthavādas constitute the largest part of the Veda, particulary in the Brāhmaṇa texts. About arthavāda the

---

2018. गोमूत्रं गोमयं क्षीरं दधि सर्पिः कुशोदकम्। एकरात्रोपवासश्च श्वपाकमपि शोधयेत्॥ वसिष्ठ 27. 3, विष्णुधर्मोत्तर II. 42. 31-32.

Tantravārtika makes[2019] a general statement that arthavāda passages coming after *vidhi* passages are weak, while those that come before vidhis are stronger.

The 3rd class of Vedic texts are mantras. They have already been treated above (vide p. 1220, notes 1979 ff.). Some mantras also lay down an injunction as in Ṛg. X. 117. 5 'pṛṇīyād-in-nādhamānāya-tavyān' (the strong must bestow wealth on one who begs), also the mantra 'vasantāya kapiñjalānālabhate' (Vāj. S. 24. 20) cited above on p. 1221. But generally mantras are only expressive or assertive and call to mind things that are connected with the acts enjoined by vidhi-vākyas (injunctive passages). The Tantravārtika[2020] notes that it is definitely understood that religious acts that are performed with mantras that recall to the mind the things enjoined lead to prosperity (or to *svarga*). The reader would notice how the Pūrvamīmāṁsā system came to relegate mantras to a secondary place and made them play a passive role in the sacrificial system. The Ṛgveda contained sublime prayers, but in the mīmāṁsā system the most prominent place was given to Brāhmaṇa texts, that contained almost all the *vidhis*. It has been seen above pp. 950–952 how Ṛgveda mantras are full of faith (*bhakti*) in God and fervent appeals to God after confession of sin and repentance; vide Ṛg. VII. 86. 4-6 (kim-āga āsa varuṇa jyeṣṭham &c.); Ṛg. III. 39 is a hymn full of beatitude, verse 2 of which says 'this prayer (dhīḥ) born of yore in heaven, sung in the holy assembly with earnestness, dressed in pure (lit-white) and auspicious garb is ours, ancient and inherited from our forefathers'.

The 4th part of Vedic texts bearing on Dharma is 'Nāmadheya' (proper names of sacrifices). There are such texts as 'one should sacrifice with the *udbhid*' (Tāṇḍya Br. 19. 7. 2-3), 'one desirous of possessing cattle should sacrifice with *citrā*'[2021] (Tai. S. II. 4. 6. 1). The question is whether in these passages what is laid down is some substance to be offered in some rite (as in

---

2019. ये हि विध्युद्देशात्परस्तादर्थवादाः श्रूयन्ते तेषामस्ति दौर्बल्यम्। ये पुरस्ताच्छ्रूयन्ते ते मुख्यत्वाद् बलीयांसो भवन्ति। तन्त्रवा. on III. 3.2.

2020. शबर on पू. मी. सू. I. 2. 32 says अर्थप्रत्यायनार्थमेव यज्ञे मन्त्रोच्चारणम्। यज्ञाङ्गप्रकाशनमेव प्रयोजनम्।; मन्त्रैरेव स्मृत्वा कृतं कर्माभ्युदयकारि भवतीत्यवधार्यते। तन्त्रवा. on II. 1. 31 p. 433.

2021. पशुकामो यजेत। यदुद्भिदा यजते बलमेवास्मै विच्यावयति यद्बलभिदा बलमेवास्मै भिनत्ति। ताण्ड्य. 19. 7. 2-3. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 269 n. 618 for the application of the Udbhidadhikaraṇa (P. M. S. I. 4. 1-2) by संस्कारप्रकाश and above p. 137 by the समयमयूख.

'dadhnā juhoti) or whether they are names of sacrifices. No substance is well-known as 'udbhid' (as *dadhi* is a well-known substance). Citrā means a female animal of variegated colour. If it is guṇavidhi (in the case of 'citrayā yajeta'), there would be the fault of Vākyabheda (one sentence broken up as laying down two vidhis) i. e. the injunction would be that a female *paśu* was to be sacrificed (not a male) and further *injunction* that its colour should be variegated. Therefore, Udbhid, Citrā, Balabhid, Abhijit, Viśvajit (Kauṣītaki Br. 25. 14) and Agnihotra (P. M. S. 1. 4. 4), Vājapeya (P. M. S. I. 4. 6-8), Vaiśvadeva (P. M. S. I. 4. 13-16) are names of rites and are not substances. Similarly, in 'Śyenenābhicaran yajeta' (one practising black magic for bringing about the death of an enemy may perform a yāga called śyena). Here 'śyena' is the name of a yāga, because the yāga swoops down upon the enemy and seizes him just as a falcon swoops down upon its victim and catches it (Ṣaḍviṁśa Br. III. 8. 1. 3). The point to be noted is that these names serve the purpose of[2022] particularising the meaning of what is enjoined. The Vedic text 'svādhyāyoऽdhyetavyaḥ' enjoins the study of the Veda consisting of all parts including nāmadheyas of sacrifices and we directly see that in such Vedic vidhis as 'Citrayā yajeta paśukāmaḥ' the name citrā is a part of the vidhi. Therefore, nāmadheya also is a puruṣārtha and is authoritative like other parts of the Veda (vide Śāstradīpikā on Jai. I. 4. 1). In the sentences mentioned above *yāga* is enjoined with the fruit as the object, since it is not otherwise established. Since it is not intended to lay down a general injunction to sacrifice, a specific variety *of* sacrifice has to be enjoined. When one wants to know the specific variety enjoined, *from* the *word* 'udbhid' it is known that it is the sacrifice called udbhid. Dharmaśāstra writers apply this maxim called 'Udbhid-nyāya' to 'Upanayana' which literally means 'taking (a boy) near an ācārya' (teacher of the Veda)'. The Saṁskāraprakāśa says so.[2023]

2022. नामधेयानां विधेयार्थपरिच्छेदकतयाऽर्थवत्त्वम्। तथाहि-उद्भिदा यजेत पशुकाम इत्यत्र उद्भिच्छब्दो यागनामधेयम्। तेन हि विधेयार्थपरिच्छेदः क्रियते। अनेन हि वाक्येनाप्राप्तत्वात्फलोद्देशेन यागो विधीयते। यागसामान्यस्य चाविधेयत्वाद्यागविशेष एव विधीयते। तत्र कोऽसौ विशेष इत्यपेक्षायां उद्भिच्छब्दादुद्भिद्रूपो यो याग इति ज्ञायते। मी. न्या. प्र. p. 206 (ABORI).

2023. तत्रोपनयनशब्दः कर्मनामधेयम्। तच्च यौगिकमुद्भिदन्यायात्। योगश्च भावव्युत्पत्त्या करणव्युत्पत्त्या वेत्याह भारुचिः। स यथा। उप समीपे आचार्यादीनां बटोर्नयनं प्रापणमुपनयनम्। समीपे आचार्यादीनां नीयते बटुर्येन तदुपनयनमिति वा। संस्कारप्रकाश p. 334.

The fifth (and last) part of Vedic texts consists of 'pratiṣedha' (niṣedha, prohibition). Prohibitions[2024] serve the ends of man by causing men to desist from actions which would produce undesirable results. To explain, just as vidhis, which express an urge or prompting (to do something), suggest, in order to effectuate their prompting quality, that the matter to be enjoined such as a sacrifice is the means to attain a desirable result and so urge a man to do it, so also prohibitions such as 'one should not eat Kalañja (red garlic)' or 'one should not utter what is false' (Tai. S. II. 5. 5. 6) denote a turning away and in order to effectuate their own deterring quality, suggest that the thing to be prohibited viz. eating kalañja or speaking untruth will be the cause of bringing about an undesirable result and so make a man desist from it. The particle 'na' may come before a verbal form, a noun or an adjective and 'na' becomes in certain cases 'a' (as in 'abrāhmaṇa,' 'adharma') and 'an' in certain others when it is prefixed to a word beginning with a vowel (as in 'anaśva', 'anuṣṇa'). Pāṇini devotes several sūtras to 'na' and expressly refers to 'pratiṣedha' as one of the meanings conveyed by 'na' (vide Pāṇ. II. 2. 6, VI. 2. 155 &c.)[2025]; 'na' is said to convey six senses as noted in the verse quoted below.[2026]

The first meaning of 'na' is 'abhāva' (non-existence). But that meaning would not suit all cases. When one says 'bring abrāhmaṇa' the meaning conveyed is not 'non-existence' since, if that were the meaning, one could not bring non-existing brāhmaṇa and so might not bring any one at all, or might

---

2024. अनर्थहेतुकर्मणः सकाशात्पुरुषस्य निवृत्तिकरत्वेन निषेधानां पुरुषार्थानुबन्धित्वम्। तथा हि। यथा विधयः प्रवर्तनामभिदधतः स्वप्रवर्तकत्वनिर्वाहार्थं विधेयस्य यागादेः श्रेयःसाधनत्वमाक्षिपन्तः पुरुषं तत्र प्रवर्तयन्ति, एवं न कलञ्जं भक्षयेदित्यादयो निषेधा अपि निवर्तनामभिदधतः स्वनिवर्तकत्वनिर्वाहार्थं निषेध्यस्य कलञ्जभक्षणादेरनर्थहेतुत्वमाक्षिपन्तः पुरुषं ततो निवर्तयन्ति। मी. न्या. प्र. pp. 248–249. Some read प्रेरणां for प्रवर्तनाम्. The meaning of both is the same. आप. ध. सू. I. 5. 17. 26 forbids the eating of कलञ्ज, पलाण्डु and परारीक and हरदत्त explains 'कलञ्जं रक्तलशुनम्' and कल्पतरु on नियतकाल p. 280 explains it as लशुनविशेष.

2025. नञो गुणप्रतिषेधे सम्पाद्यर्हहितालमर्थास्तद्धिताः। पा. VI. 2. 155.

2026. तत्सादृश्यमभावश्च तदन्यत्वं तदल्पता। अप्राशस्त्यं विरोधश्च नञर्थाः षट् प्रकीर्तिताः॥ q. on p. 430 of the com. भाट्टालंकार on मी. न्या. प्र. (Chowkhamba S.S.). अब्राह्मण means ब्राह्मणादन्य (i. e. नञ् suggests here तदन्यत्व) and अधर्म means धर्मविरोधि, as stated by श्लोकवा. (अपोहवाद verse 33) 'नामधात्वर्थयोगी च नैव नञ् प्रतिषेधकः। वदतोऽब्राह्मणाधर्मावन्यमात्रविरोधिनौ॥'. The महाभाष्य on वार्तिक 4 on पा. III. 1. 12 says 'नञिवयुक्तमन्यसदृशाधिकरणे तथा ह्यर्थगतिः' and explains 'अब्राह्मणमानयेत्युक्ते (के?) ब्राह्मणसदृश आनीयते नासौ लोष्टमानीय कृती भवति'.

bring a clod of earth which would not fulfil any purpose of the person addressing these words and therefore, on hearing this, a person not a brāhmaṇa but resembling a brāhmaṇa (such as a kṣatriya) is brought. So in this case 'abrāhmaṇa' means a person other than a brāhmaṇa; 'na' also conveys the opposite (*virodha*) of that to which it is prefixed. It has been seen above that the verb is the main part in a sentence and in the verbal form it is the termination that is the principal part. So, in '*one must not eat kalañja*' the negative particle 'na' must be held to be connected with the optative termination in 'bhakṣayet'. In a vidhi[2027] (or on hearing a vidhi) one perceives that the sentence urges the listener to be active. When 'na' is prefixed to an optative from it conveys the opposite of urging viz. '*nivartana*' (desisting from something). The phala that one understands from a vidhi is as in 'yajeta svargakāmaḥ' *svarga*, while in a prohibition the phala is cessation of harm (anartha-nivṛtti). The adhikārī in a vidhi is one who desires svarga; in a niṣedha the adhikārī is one who is afraid of harm and desires to avoid what is undesirable. Therefore, these considerations establish that exhortation and prohibition are entirely different in their import.

But when there is an obstacle or difficulty in construing 'na' with the verbal termination, then it is construed with the meaning of the root. These obstacles are of two sorts; one is where the whole passage is introduced by the words 'his vows are' or where an option will emerge if the meaning of prohibition is stuck to. In the case of these two obstacles in sentences where

---

2027. अतो लिङन्तांशेन नञ सम्बध्यते। तस्य सर्वापेक्षया प्राधान्यात्। नञश्चैष स्वभावो यत्स्वसम्बन्धिप्रतिपक्षबोधकत्वम्। ... तदिह लिङर्थस्तावत्प्रवर्तना। अतस्तेन सम्बध्यमानो नञ् प्रवर्तनाप्रतिपक्षं निवर्तनां गमयति। अतश्च सर्वत्र निषेधेषु निवर्तनैव वाक्यार्थः। एवं च विधिनिषेधयोर्भिन्नार्थत्वं सिद्धं भवति। यथाहुः। अन्तरं यादृशं लोके ब्रह्महत्याश्वमेधयोः। दृश्यते तादृगेवेदं विधानप्रतिषेधयोः॥ इति। तथा। ...सर्वथापि तु नञः प्राधान्यात्प्रत्ययेनान्वयः। यदा तु तदन्वये किञ्चिद्बाधकं तदागत्या धात्वर्थेनान्वयः। तच्च बाधकं द्विविधम्। तस्य व्रतमित्युपक्रमो विकल्पप्रसक्तिश्च। तेन च बाधकद्वयेन नञ्युक्तेषु वाक्येषु पर्युदासाश्रयणं भवति। तदभावे निषेध एव। <u>पर्युदासः स विज्ञेयो यत्रोत्तरपदेन नञ्। प्रतिषेधः स विज्ञेयः क्रियया सह यत्र नञ्॥</u> इति च तयोर्लक्षणम्। तत्र-नेक्षतोद्यन्तमादित्यम्-इत्यादौ पर्युदासाश्रयणम्, तस्य व्रतमित्युपक्रमात्। तथाहि व्रतशब्देन कर्तव्योर्थ उच्यते। मी. न्या. प्र. pp. 250–253. The न्यायसुधा (or राणक) p. 201 on तन्त्रवा. quotes the verse अन्तरं ... धयोः as from the बृहट्टीका (of कुमारिल) and cites verses explaining the five points (फल &c.) in which विधि and निषेध differ. The word उत्तरपद is a technical मीमांसा word and means the termination in the verbal form and पूर्वपद means the pada minus the termination. विधिः प्रवर्तमानो हि श्रेयःसिद्ध्यै प्रवर्तते। प्रतिषेधः पुनः पापान्निवर्तयति भेदतः। तन्त्रवा. on पू. मी. सू. III. 4. 13 p. 911.

'na' occurs, we would have to resort to *paryudāsa* (exclusion or exception). In the case of the Prajāpativratas[2028] (which are puruṣārtha as decided in P. M. S. IV. 1. 3) the passage starts with the words 'his vows are' and then comes the sentence 'he must not see the sun rising or setting' (Kauṣītaki Br. VI. 6). Vrata means a mental act, a resolve not to do a certain thing, the meaning being 'he should make a resolve to act in such a way as not to see the rising or setting sun and stick to it'. This really is niyama (restriction). This passage does not mean that he should never look at the sun (there is no prohibition of seeing the sun) but it only excludes the sight of the rising or setting sun; therefore, this is only exclusion and he who observes this niyama (restriction) secures the reward while in the case of eating kalañja there is a total prohibition. 'Paryudāsa (exclusion) is to be understood where the negative particle is taken with another word (i. e. with the verbal root or a different word such as a noun); prohibition is to be understood where the negative particle is taken with the verbal form'.

In Dharmaśāstra works, 'na' is frequently explained as laying down a paryudāsa (proviso or exception). In the section on the duties of a *snātaka* in Yāj. I. 129-166 'na' occurs very often. The Mit. explains (on Yaj. I. 129) that in this section wherever 'na' occurs it is meant to denote a paryudāsa (sarvatrāpi asmin snātakaprakaraṇe nañ-śabdaḥ pratyekam paryudāsārtha eva), To take only one example, Yāj. in I. 132 provides that one should not speak (to a man or woman) what would be painful without any necessity or cause. This does not altogether prohibit speaking what is painful; what it means is that a *snātaka* may say to another what is painful except when there is no proper reason nor proper occasion to do so. One may have to speak what is painful to an erring son or friend or near relative. Aparārka (pp. 206-207) quotes two well-known

2028. युक्तं यत्प्रजापतिव्रतेषु शास्त्राणामर्थवत्त्वेन पुरुषार्थो विधीयते। तत्र नियमः कर्तव्यतयोपदिश्यते। ... तस्य व्रतमिति प्रकृत्य प्रजापतिव्रतानि समाम्नातानि। व्रतमिति च मानसं कर्मोच्यते। इदं न करिष्यामीति यः सङ्कल्पः। कतमत्तद् व्रतम्। नोद्यन्तमादित्यमीक्षेतेति। यथा तदीक्षणं न भवति तथा मानसो व्यापारः कर्तव्यः। तस्य च पालनम्। तत्र तस्मात्पुरुषार्थोऽस्तीत्यवगन्तव्यम्। ... न हि कलञ्जं भक्षयन् प्रतिषेधविधिं नातिक्रामति। इह पुनरादित्यं पश्यन्नातिक्रामति विधिम्। न हि तस्य दर्शनं प्रतिषिद्धम्। नियमस्तत्रोपदिष्टः। यस्तं नियमं करोति स फलेन सम्बध्यते। इह तु प्रतिषिध्यते कलञ्जादि। शबर on पू. मी. सू. VI. 2. 20. In the कौषी. ब्रा. VI. 6 (or शा. ब्रा.) we read तस्य व्रतमुद्यन्तमेवैनं नेक्षेतास्तं यन्तं चेति। मनु IV. 37 has a similar provision 'नेक्षेतोद्यन्तमादित्यं नास्तं यान्तं कदाचन'. Vide अनुशासनपर्व 104. 18, वसिष्ठ XII. 10 (among स्नातकव्रतs), विष्णुधर्मसूत्र 71. 17-18 for almost the same words.

verses on the distinction between *paryudāsa* and *pratiṣedha* (the two halves of which are quoted and underlined in note 2027) on the interpretation of a verse requiring a man having a son not to observe a fast on certain days &c. The first halves of those verses are; 'Pradhānatvam vidhauyatra pratiṣedheṣpradhānatā (paryudāsaḥ...nañ) ॥ aprādhānyam vidhau yatra pratiṣedhe pradhānatā । prasajyaprati...nañ'.॥

When the particle 'na' is employed in a sentence, it is either a prohibition or a paryudāsa or an arthavāda. These three have to be clearly distinguished. In Darśapūrṇamāsa the two *ājyabhāgas* are an aṅga (P. M. S. IV. 4. 30) and a passage states that the two ājyabhāgas are the eyes of the Darśapūrṇamāsa sacrifice.[2029] In connection with this the Veda says 'these two are not performed in an animal sacrifice nor in a Soma sacrifice'. The question is; is this a prohibition or a paryudāsa or an arthavāda. A pratiṣedha occurs only when there is the possibility of what is prohibited following as a matter of course. As the *ājyabhāgas* are prescribed in Darśapūrṇamāsa there is no possibility of these two being required in a Somayāga and there is no real prohibition. Nor is there *paryudāsa*, for if it be a paryudāsa there would be no proper connection, since in paryudāsa one would have to say 'there are ājyabhāgas in darśapūrṇamāsa except in somayāgs', which would be absurd. Therefore, these words 'na tau paśau karoti na some' contain an arthavāda. A true[2030] prohibition would occur only when something is first prescribed and then prohibited. The stock example is of the Ṣoḍaśin cup; there are two Vedic sentences of equal authority 'he takes the ṣoḍaśin cup in Atirātra' and 'he does not take the Ṣoḍaśin cup in atirātra'; owing to this conflict an option is allowed. Similarly, there is a Vedic passage 'Vrīhibhir yajeta yavairvā' (one shall offer a sacrifice with grains of rice or with yavas). Therefore, in the above two cases where the two texts are irreconcilable, there is

2029. चक्षुषी वा एते यज्ञस्य यदाज्यभागौ यजति चक्षुषी एव तद्यज्ञस्य प्रतिदधाति। तै. सं. II. 6. 2. 1.

2030. शिष्ट्वा तु प्रतिषेधः स्यात्। पू. मी. सू. X. 8. 6. शबर explains 'यथा नातिरात्रे गृह्णाति षोडशिनमिति। न तत्र शक्यं वक्तुं पर्युदास इति। सम्बन्ध एव हि न स्यात्। अतिरात्रवर्जितातिरात्रे गृह्णाति षोडशिनमिति। नापि कस्यचिदर्थवादत्वेन सम्भवति। ... यत्र पुनरन्यार्थवचनव्यक्तिरस्ति वाक्यस्य तत्र न विकल्पो भवति।, एवमेषोऽष्टदोषोऽपि यद् व्रीहियववाक्ययोः। विकल्प आश्रितस्तत्र गतिरन्या न विद्यते। व्रीहिशास्त्रप्रवृत्तौ हि यवशास्त्रेण कुध्यते। ओता तत्र प्रवृत्तोपि व्रीहिशास्त्रेण कुध्यते। तन्त्रवा. on I. 3. 3 p. 175. Vide also प्राप्तिपूर्वो हि प्रतिषेधो भवति। शबर on पू. मी. सू. VII. 3. 20 and VII. 3. 23.

no way except that of allowing an option (vikalpa). But 'vikalpa' is liable to eight faults.[2031] Therefore, an effort has to be made to avoid option and accept as far as possible a paryudāsa or arthavāda, since by accepting an option, the authoritative statement in one case or the other has to be regarded as unauthoritative and not binding. Śabara and Tantravārtika provide that *vikalpa* should be resorted to only in case there is no other way. The P. M. S. lays down that vikalpa may be accepted when several things having the same object (or sense) are stated by several authoritative texts.

There is one more word that must be explained, viz. *nityānuvāda.*[2032] This word occurs in Āpastambadharmasūtra II. 6. 14. 13 (vide n. 1877 above). It occurs frequently in Jaimini (vide II. 4. 26, IV. I. 5, VI. 7. 30, VII. 4. 5, VIII. 1. 6, IX. 4. 36, X. 2. 38) and Śabara uses it oftener still. He explains that where the Vedic text apparently prohibits something when there is no possibility of what is prohibited as happening, there is nityānuvāda (as in 'the fire altar should not be piled on bare earth nor in the sky nor in heaven'). The Ṭupṭīkā states the same thing in a different form when it says that where a prohibition amounts to an arthavāda, that is nityānuvāda.

Vikalpas (options) are grouped under three heads viz. those indicated by logic or reasoning, (2) those due to express words and (3) those dependent on the will of the performer. An example of the first kind is the option about rice grains and barley grains (yavair vrīhibhir-vā yajeta). The 2nd may be exemplified from Manu III. 267, which says that the Manes derive satisfaction for a month when offerings are made of sesame or of rice or of barley or of māṣa pulse or of water or of fruits and roots.

2031. एकार्थास्तु विकल्पेरन् समुच्चये ह्यावृत्तिः स्यात्प्रधानस्य । पू. मी. सू. XII. 3, 10. The eight faults of allowing an option between two provisions are set out in मी. न्या प्र. p. 151 and Prof. Edgerton's translation of मी. न्या. प्र. paragraph 318 pp. 163–164, n. 212. The एकादशीतत्त्व (p. 42) discusses the व्रीहियववाक्य, quotes the verse एवमेषोऽष्टदोषोऽपि° and points out the eight doṣas. The three words पर्युदास, प्रतिषेध and विकल्प occur in one sūtra viz पू. मी. सू X. 8. 15 'अपि तु वाक्यशेषत्वादितरपर्युदासः स्यात्प्रतिषेधे विकल्पः स्यात्' which is quoted in the शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. III. 3. 26). The भामती remarks (on this sūtra) that these words are only a summary of the original sūtra which is 'अपि वा वाक्यशेषः स्यादन्याय्यत्वाद्विकल्पस्य विधीनामेकदेशः स्यात् ।.'

2032. असति प्रसङ्गे प्रतिषेधो नित्यानुवादः । शबर on I. 2. 18 ; यथार्थवादत्वेन प्रतिषेधस्तत्र नित्यानुवादो भवति । टुप्टीका on VII, 3, 21 ; on IX. 4. 36 (परो नित्यानुवादः स्यात्) शबर explains : नित्यमेतमर्थं सन्तमनुवदति.

' An option depending on the will of a person occurs in the Jābālopaniṣad[2033] (4) 'after finishing the period of studenthood one should become a householder, after becoming a householder, one should become a forest hermit and after becoming a forest hermit one may become a wandering ascetic (sannyāsin or parivrāḍ); or following another method one may become a wandering ascetic after finishing studenthood or after becoming an householder or after becoming a forest hermit.' The latter part of this passage gives an option as to āśramas.' This option is referred to by Gautama in the words 'some sages allow an option as to āśramas to him (to brahmacārin).' When Yāj. I. 14 provides that the *Upanayana* of a brāhmaṇa boy may be performed in the eighth year from conception or from birth there is an option depending on the will of the father.

Manu IV. 7 provides that a *dvija* should amass as much corn as would fill a granary (i. e. as would last for a year) or a Kumbhī (for six months) or as much as would suffice for three days or may not care to amass even for to-morrow. These are four options and then Manu IV. 8 provides that a *dvija* who is an householder may choose one of these four, but each succeeding one is superior in point of merit and otherworldly rewards.

A *vikalpa* may also be *vyavasthita* (restricted or limited to a certain set of circumstances) or avyavasthita (not restricted). The Āp. Dh. S. provides[2034] that one should offer *bali* with his hand in the *aupāsana* fire or in the kitchen fire with the first six mantras. Haradatta remarks that 'This is a limited option' viz. in the aupāsana fire bali should be cast every day by those who have kept up that fire and in the ordinary kitchen fire by

---

2033. ब्रह्मचर्यं परिसमाप्य गृही भवेत्। गृही भूत्वा वनी भवेत्। वनी भूत्वा प्रव्रजेत्। यदि वेतरथा ब्रह्मचर्यादेव प्रव्रजेद्गृहाद्वा वनाद्वा। जाबालोप. 4, q. by शङ्कराचार्य in his भाष्य on ब्रह्मसूत्र III. 4. 20 with the remark 'अनपेक्ष्यैव जाबालश्रुतिमाश्रमान्तर-विधायिनीमयमाचार्येण विचारः प्रवर्तितः'. The विषयवाक्य of ब्रह्मसूत्र III. 4. 18-20 is छान्दोग्य II. 23. 1 'त्रयो धर्मस्कन्धाः ... ब्रह्मसंस्थोऽमृतत्वमेति।' and the ब्रह्मसूत्र mentions the views of जैमिनि and बादरायण on this छान्दोग्य passage and the established conclusion is 'विधिर्वा धारणवत्' III. 4. 20. गौतमधर्मसूत्र says 'तस्याश्रमविकल्पमेके ब्रुवते' III. 1, तस्य referring to ब्रह्मचारिन्. The जाबालोपनिषद् does not appear to have been known to the author of the Brahmasūtra while views similar to those propounded by it were known to Gautama. The Mit. on Yāj. III. 56 refers to the Jābālopaniṣad as allowing an option 'तथा च विकल्पो जाबालश्रुतौ श्रूयते ब्रह्मचर्यं ... वनाद्वा। इति। ... एतेषां समुच्चयविकल्पबाधपक्षाणां सर्वेषां श्रुतिमूलत्वादिच्छया विकल्पः।'.

2034. औपासने पचने वा षड्भिराद्यैः प्रतिमन्त्रं हस्तेन जुहुयात्। आप. ध. सू. II. 2.3. 16; 'औपासनवतामौपासने विधुराद्यैः पचने इति व्यवस्थितो विकल्पः। हरदत्त.

him whose wife is dead. Manu III. 82 prescribes that one should offer *Śrāddha* everyday with food, water, milk etc. Here there is vyavasthita-vikalpa i. e. first food, then in its absence milk, fruits and roots, and in the absence of these water. When Manu IV. 95 prescribes "Having performed the Upākarma rite according to proper procedure on the Full Moon of Śrāvaṇa or of Bhādrapada a brāhmaṇa should diligently study the Vedas for four months and a half." Medhātithi says that this is a 'vyavasthita-vikalpa' viz. the Sāmavedins should perform upākarma on Bhādrapada Full Moon, while Ṛgvedins and Yajurvedins on Śrāvaṇa Full Moon. Vide the Mit. on Yāj. I. 254 about the *sapiṇḍana* of a mother, where the Mit. introduces order among conflicting texts. When Gaut. prescribes (III. 21) that a *sannyāsin* should completely shave the head or keep only a top-knot, there is an option depending on the will of the person. Gaut. II. 51-53, Āp. Dh. S. I. 2. 11, Manu III. 1 prescribe *brahmacarya* for Veda study for 48, 36, 24, 12, 3 years. Here there is an option depending on the capacity and wish of the student. It should be noted that the eight faults about accepting an option do not occur in a vyavasthita[2035] vikalpa nor do they apply where the option is dependent on the volition of the performer nor where option is given by express texts. Those eight faults apply only to an option indicated by reasoning.

The Mīmāṁsābālāprakāśa (pp. 153-165) provides a long list of the divisions and subdivisions of Vikalpa.

Śāstra is meant to give definite rules as stated by Patañjali,[2036] and therefore all Śāstrik works try to reduce options to the minimum and assign to apparently conflicting passages separate and definite provinces of application (*Viṣayavyavasthā*). Sometimes, the options are so many that commentators give up the task of assigning them different scopes e. g. the Mit. on Yāj. III. 22, after quoting the conflicting passages on impurity on birth and death, for kṣatriyas, vaiśyas and śūdras

---

2035. सर्वस्मिंश्च व्यवस्थितविकल्पे पूर्वोक्ता अष्टौ दोषा न सन्ति। ...एवमैच्छिकविकल्पेऽप्यष्टौ दोषा न सन्ति कस्यापि शास्त्रस्य प्रतीतप्रामाण्यत्यागाद्यभावात्। ...एवमेव वाचनिकेऽपि विकल्पेऽष्टौ दोषा न सन्ति। ...तस्मान्न्यायगम्ये विकल्प एवाष्टदोषत्वमिति सिद्धम्। मी. बा. प्र. pp. 161-162.

2036. न ह्यव्यवस्थाकारिणा शास्त्रेण भवितव्यम्। शास्त्रतो हि नाम व्यवस्था। महाभाष्य on वार्तिक 4 (तथा चानवस्था) on पा. VI. 1. 135; एवमनेकोऽशौचकल्पा दर्शिताः। तेषां लोके समाचाराभावान्नातीव व्यवस्थाप्रदर्शनमुपयोगीति नात्र व्यवस्था प्रदर्श्यते॥ मिता. on या. III. 22.

from Parāśara, Śātātapa, Vasiṣṭha and Atri gives up the effort to bring order because it would be of no use as people do not accept the dicta of these in practice.

Two other words require some explanation. They are 'ārādupakāraka' and 'sannipatyopakāraka'. In the 3rd chapter of the PMS the author deals[2037] with *śeṣa*, its definition and explains how to determine what things are called *śeṣa* and what are *śeṣin*. Kumārila sets out five definitions of the word śeṣa, discards four and accepts one, viz. 'śeṣa' is that which serves the purpose of another. Śabara comments that what serves to help another is called śeṣa and the other is called śeṣin. Śabara adds a qualification viz. that is śeṣa which is of very much help to another. Bādari holds that there are three groups of śeṣa viz. *dravya* (materials for sacrifice such as rice-grains), *guṇa* (such as the reddish colour of the cow that is the price of the *soma* to be purchased), *saṁskāras* (purificatory acts such as the pounding of the grains in mortar and pestle which make the grains fit for turning them into puroḍāśa). Jaimini adds that rites (karmāṇi) like yāga, fruit or result (of yāga) are śeṣa as regards the performer and the performer is śeṣa with reference to the yāga. According to Bādari, *dravya*, *guṇa*, *saṁskāra* are always śeṣa, while according to the established conclusion, yāga, reward and performer (*yāga*, *phala* and *puruṣa*) may be according to circumstances either śeṣa or śeṣin. After a long discussion the Tantravārtika sums up the discussion that dravya, guṇa, and saṁskāra are with reference to *yāga* invariably śeṣa, though they may be śeṣin with reference to their own constituent elements, while as regards *phala*, *yāga* and the performer they can be both śeṣa and śeṣin with reference to each other. For example, in the Darśa-Pūrṇamāsa sacrifice there are various items, such as taking out handfuls of rice grains (for sacrifice), sprinkling water on them, pounding them; then certain acts are to be performed with reference to *ājya* (clarified butter) viz. purifying it with two blades of *kuśa* grass, melting it, also bringing a branch, starting the cows towards the meadows &c. These auxiliaries are of two kinds, viz. (i) that are already accomplished, (ii) that are of the nature

---

2037. शेषः परार्थत्वात्। पू. मी. सू. III. 1. 2; कः शेषः केन हेतुना शेषः कर्म च विनियुज्यते। इति। श्रुत्यादीनि च विनियोगे कारणानीति वक्ष्यते च। तेषां च [illegible]। [illegible]; शेषत्वं केचिदिच्छन्ति [illegible]। [illegible] [illegible]। [illegible] [illegible]। [illegible] शेषत्वं [illegible]। तन्त्रवा. on III. 1. 2 p. 654.

of actions. The first comprehend substances, number &c.; those that are of the nature of acts are two-fold viz. *sannipatyopakāraka* and *ārād-upakāraka*. In the Paurṇamāsī rite there are such auxiliaries as Prayājas, the Āghāras, the Ājyabhāgas. These are ārādupakāraka. Sannipatyopakārakas are also called sāmavāyika, or āśrayikarmāṇi; they are such as the pounding of grains, *prokṣaṇa* etc. The Ārādupakāraka are [2038] rites prescribed without being meant to do something about substances and are directly the *aṅgas* of the principal rite. These do not give rise to any saṁskāra (embellishment or making fit) in the substance meant to be offered in sacrifice, are helpful in producing the *paramāpūrva* that yields the fruit of the whole rite. They produce a subordinate *apūrva* of their own. They are directly aṅgas of the principal rite and are distinguished from sannipatyopakārakas, which are saṁskāraka (bring about some embellishment or fitness). The Sannipatyopakārakas are more powerful than Ārādupakārakas and therefore the Tantravārtika states the proposition that where it is possible to hold an act [2039] in a rite to be sannipatyopakāraka or sāmavāyika, it is not proper to regard it as ārādupakāraka. It is somewhat remarkable that Prof. Keith in his 'Karmamīmāṁsā' (p. 88) inverts the meaning of these two words. The explanation of *sannipatyopakāraka* in 'Prābhākara School' (by M. M. Jha) p. 181 also is rather obscure. The Ekādaśītattva (p. 97), while discussing the substitutes (pratinidhis) to be employed on Ekādaśī for ghee, for milk and honey (being milk-powder, curds and jaggery) quotes P. M. S. VI. 3. 18 'na devatāgniśabdakriyam-anyārthasaṁyogāt', explains that in place of a prescribed *kriyā* like prayājas (that have an unseen or spiritual reward) there is to be no substitute, since what has an invisible result is āradupakāraka, but in place of rice grains (that are the means of preparing *puroḍāśa*) a substitute may be employed, since the rice grains are sannipatyopakārakas and have a seen purpose viz. preparing puroḍāṣa. Śaṅkarācārya in his bhāṣya on

2038. अपि च द्विविधान्यङ्गानि। आरादुपकारकाणि सामवायिकानि च। आरादुपकारकेभ्यः सामवायिकानि गरीयांसि। तत्र हि साक्षाद्वाक्यम्। आरादुपकारेषु प्रकृतेन परोक्षेणैकवाक्यता स्यात्। तस्मात्संस्कारकर्मेति। शबर on X. 4. 38. आरात् means दूरात् acc. to शबर on X. 8. 16. तत्र कर्माङ्गद्रव्याद्युद्देशेन विधीयमानं कर्म संनिपत्योपकारकम्, यथावघातप्रोक्षणादि। इदमेव चाश्रयि कर्मोच्यते। मी. न्या. प्र. pp. 163–164 ; द्रव्याद्यनुद्दिश्य केवलं विधीयमानं कर्म आरादुपकारकम्। यथा प्रयाजादि। ibid p. 168 ; vide मीमांसापरिभाषा p. 13.

2039. न च सामवायिकत्वे सम्भवत्यारादुपकारककल्पना युक्ता। तन्त्रवा. on III. 4. 12 p. 902.

V. S. IV. I. 16 states that the performance of obligatory vedic rites (like Agnihotra) by a man who has to acquire knowledge of brahma is helpful for attaining it as an āradupakāraka.[2040]

Apart from the Veda and smṛtis the Pūrvamīmāṁsā relies upon or refers to *loka* or *lokavat* (usage of the ordinary people) for elucidation. For example, I. 2. 20, I. 2. 29, II. 1. 12 (Lokavat), IV. 1.6 'tathā ca lokabhūteṣu' meaning 'lokepi'), VI. 2. 16 (loke karmāṇi vedavat-tatoऽdhipuruṣajñānam), VI. 5. 34 (na bhaktitvād-eṣā hi loke), VI. 8. 26 (yāñcā-krayaṇam-avidyamāne lokavat), VII. 4. 11 (Liṅgahetutvād-aliṅge laukikam syāt), VIII 2. 22 (payo vā tat-pradhānatvāl-lokavad-dadhnas-tadarthatvāt) gives the illustration that in order to solidify milk a little of curds is enough; VIII. 4. 6, (na laukikānām &c. where 'laukikānām' means 'lokānām'); X. 3.44 (śabdārthaścāpi lokavat), X. 3. 51, X. 6. 8, X. 7. 66 (Lokavat, Śabara saying 'Yathā matsyān na payasā samaśnīyāt), XI. 1. 23, 26, 62. Śabara himself uses the word 'Laukikanyāya' in bhāṣya on PMS III. 4. 13 (evam varṇyamāne laukikayāyānugataḥ sūtrārtho varṇito bhaviṣyati' p. 926).[2041]

Jaimini dealt with the eternal, self-existent and absolutely authoritative character of the Veda as regards Dharma in the first *pāda* of the first chapter and also dealt with the means of knowledge, the eternal character of the relation of words and senses. In the second pāda of the first adhyāya he pronounced that arthavādas which form a very large portion of the Veda were meant to laud the *Vidhis* with which they were connected and were not to be treated as useless. He also provided that mantras (that formed part of the veda) had a purpose to serve viz. that of recalling to the mind the meaning of the rites performed, that some mantras like 'catvāri śṛṅgā'[2041a] (Ṛg. IV.

2040. तद्भूतकर्मणोऽपि ज्ञानसंयुक्तस्य मोक्षकार्योपपत्तेः। नन्वनारभ्यो मोक्षः कथमस्य कर्मकार्यत्वमुच्यते। नैष दोषः। आरादुपकारकत्वात्कर्मणः। ज्ञानस्यैव हि प्रापकं सत्कर्म प्रणाड्या मोक्षकारणमित्युपचर्यते। वेदान्तसूत्रभाष्य IV. 1. 16.

2041. शबर on VII. 4. 12 explains the nyāya स्थालीपुलाक: यथा स्थाल्यां तुल्यपाकानां पुलाकानामेकमुपमृद्यान्येषामपि सिद्धतां जानाति।; शबर on VIII. 1. 11 employs it 'अविकृत्स्नेऽपि स्थालीपुलाकवत्सिद्धिः'; the तन्त्रवार्तिक employs it on III. 5. 19 (p. 991) 'एकदेशस्थमपि लिङ्गं स्थालीपुलाकन्यायेन समस्तशेषकं भविष्यति'।

2041a. The objections about 'catvāri śṛṅgā' and the quotations are raised in P. M. S. I. 2. 31, which is a very long sūtra, and are answered in I. 2. 32–45. P. M. S. I. 2. 38 deals with the verse चत्वारि शृङ्गा. This verse is explained in Nirukta XIII. 7, in पतञ्जलि's महाभाष्य, by Śabara, by Kumārila

(*Continued on next page*)

58. 3) are laudatory of *yāga*, by means of a metaphor, that the sense of some words in the mantras like 'Jarbharī turpharītū (Ṛg. X. 106. 6) or 'Indraḥ somasya kāṇukā' (Ṛg. VIII. 77. 4) about which it is argued that no sense can be made out of them are really explicable with the help of Nirukta (etymology) and grammar, that some words like 'Kīkaṭa', 'Naicāśākha', and 'Pramaganda', that are claimed to refer to a country, a city, a king and therefore are claimed to make the mantra (Ṛg. III. 53. 14) non-eternal, can be explained in a different way. In this way, no part of the Veda is anarthaka (without sense or useless) or non eternal. The Mīmāṁsakas are very keen on avoiding *ānarthakya* of any Vedic words or sentences.

In the third pāda of the first chapter Jaimini deals with the authoritativeness of smṛtis, the usages of respectable and learned people (*sadācāra*), the Vedāṅgas &c.

It appears that before Jaimini composed his sūtra, smṛtis had come into prominence and the usages of the śiṣṭas had been recognised as one of the sources of Dharma. The Dharmasūtras of Gautama, Āpastamba, and[2042] others had declared that the Vedas, the Smṛtis and the usages of those who know the Vedas are the sources of Dharma. Therefore, the Śāntiparva (137.

(Continued from last page)

(in Tantravārtika p. 155–156), by Durga and Sāyaṇa. These differ a good deal (even Kumārila widely differs from Śabara). जर्भरी तुर्फरीतू are epithets of the Aśvins and explained in Nirukta (XIII. 5), Kāṇukā (in Nirukta V. 10), Kīkaṭa and other words in Nirukta VI. 32. Yāska says 'Kīkaṭa is a country in which non-Āryans resided, while Tantravārtika (p. 158) first explained it as meaning a country and affirmed that a country is eternal. Then Kumārila proposes that Kīkaṭa means 'close-fisted', Pramaganda 'usurious man', 'naicā-śākham' means wealth of an impotent person. Śabara on P. M. S. I. 2. 41 (pp. 156–157) विद्यमानोऽप्यर्थः प्रमादालस्यादिभिर्नोपलभ्यते। निगमनिरुक्तव्याकरणवशेन धातुतोऽर्थः कल्पयितव्यः। यथा सृण्येव जर्भरी तुर्फरीतू इत्येवमादीन्यश्विनोरभिधानानि द्विवचनान्तानि लक्ष्यन्ते।'. सृण्येव जर्भरी तुर्फरीतू occur in Ṛg. X. 106.6; the words निगम ... कल्पयितव्यः again occur in शाबरभाष्य on P. M. S. I. 3. 10. In तन्त्रवार्तिक p. 259 (on I. 3. 24) we find 'कार्त्स्न्येऽपि व्याकरणस्य निरुक्ते हीनलक्षणाः प्रयोगा बहवो यद्वद् ब्राह्मणो ब्रवणादिति.' The निरुक्त I. 15 has the words तदिदं विद्यास्थानं व्याकरणस्य कार्त्स्न्यम्. Vide तन्त्रवार्तिक pp. 268–269 for other references to निरुक्त. On P. M. S. XI. 1. 24 Śabara quotes भावप्रधानमाख्यातं (निरुक्त I. 1).

2042. वेदो धर्ममूलं तद्विदां च स्मृतिशीले। गौ. I. 2; धर्मज्ञसमयः प्रमाणं वेदाश्च। आप. ध. सू. I. 1. 1. 2–3. तस्य च व्यवहारो वेदो धर्मशास्त्राण्यङ्गान्युपवेदाः पुराणम्। गौ. XI. 19, where हरदत्त explains तस्य राज्ञः व्यवहारो लोकमर्यादास्थापनम्. Vide मनु II. 6 and या. I. 7.

23, 135. 22 in Citrao ed.) mentions Dharmaśāstras and Anuśāsanaparva (45. 17) quotes gāthās from Yama's Dharmaśāstra. Therefore, Jaimini had to consider whether smṛtis and usages were authoritative in the matter of Dharma and, if so, to what extent. Even if smṛtis were held to be unauthoritative, the authoritativeness of the Veda would not be affected; but the very first sūtra (of P. M. S.) postulated that the work would consider the question about the characteristics of Dharma and, therefore, smṛtis that were called Dharmaśāstra (Manu II. 10) were connected with the discussion about Dharma. Besides, from VI. 7. 6 it follows that[2043] Jaimini knew Dharmaśāstras as he provides that in a Viśvajit the performer cannot make a śūdra a subject of gift simply because he serves a man of higher caste on account of the ordinances of Dharmaśāstra. Even in the Upaniṣads (as in Tai. Up. I.11) the teacher after the pupil had completed Veda study impresses upon the latter that whenever he would have a doubt about the rites enjoined or about proper conduct he should follow the conduct of brāhmaṇas in his country that act after proper consideration, that are devoted to their duties and are not driven to do anything by another, are not harsh of character, that are intent on doing their duties. This amounts to following 'sadācāra' as a source of dharma. Jaimini employs the word 'smṛti' *in the sense of works in several sūtras as in* VI. 8. 23 (which contains the very words that the Āp. Gṛ. sūtra employs), IX. 2. 1, XII. 4. 43. Śabara mentions 'smṛti' and the word 'smarati' and 'smaranti' more than a dozen times.

The following passages may be noted. On[2044] P. M. S. I. 3. 2. Śabara says "pramāṇam smṛtiḥ"; on P. M. S. I, 3. 3 he

2043. शूद्रश्च धर्मशास्त्रत्वात्। पू. मी. सू. VI. 7. 6: विश्वजित्येव सन्दिह्यते। किं परिचारकः शूद्रो देयो नेति। ... एवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः। शूद्रश्च न देय इत्यन्वादेशः। कुतः। धर्मशास्त्रत्वात् धर्मशासनोपनतत्वात्तस्य. Vide मनु X. 123 for śūdra's duty to serve higher varṇas and गौतम (XI. 57–59).

2044. अष्टाचत्वारिंशद्वर्षाणि वेदब्रह्मचर्यचरणं जातपुत्रः कृष्णकेशोऽग्नीनादधीत इत्यनेन विरुद्धम्। क्रीतराजकोऽभोज्यान्न इति 'तस्मादग्नीषोमीये संस्थिते यजमानस्य गृहेऽशितव्यमित्यनेन विरुद्धम्। शबर on I. 3. 2; बौ. ध. सू. I. 2. 1 is अष्टाचत्वारिंशद्वर्षाणि वेदब्रह्मचर्यम्'; आप. ध. सू. I. 6. 18. 16 and 23 are सङ्घान्नमभोज्यम्। दीक्षितोऽक्रीतराजकः; Manu X. 89 forbids the sale of horses and other animals that are ekaśapha, while Tai. S. II. 3. 12. 1 stating that Varuṇa seizes him who accepts the gift of a horse practically forbids it. The Ṛgveda highly praises donors of horses e. g. in X. 107. 2 उच्चा दिवि दक्षिणावन्तो अस्थुर्ये अश्वदाः सह ते सूर्येण. On p. 226 of 'Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its sources' Sir. G. Jha translates 'giving and accepting in gift and buying and selling of lions, horses &c.' केसरिन् means 'lion' and also as an adjective 'having a mane' qualifying 'horses'; vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 850 n. 1647 criticizing this translation.

mentions three smṛti rules, two of which can be said to correspond with extant smṛtis; on PMS VI. I. 5, while dealing with the question whether lower animals (dogs &c.) have *adhikāra* for Vedic rites, Śabara denies their adhikāra, since they do not study the Veda nor the smṛtiśāstras (as men do); on PMS VI. 2. 21-22 (when the question is whether the smārta rules that a teacher should be followed or obeyed and obeisance be made to him and whether one should get up and honour an old man apply to even children whose upanayana is not performed) Śabara states that smṛti is equal to Veda (Vedatulyā hi smṛitiḥ, vaidikā eva padārthā smaryanta ityuktam). On VI. 8. 23 he quotes one quarter of a śloka as smṛti (smaranti-teṣu kāleṣu daivāni-iti). On VI. 7. 31 he says that smṛti speaks of gandharvas living for a thousand years. On VI. I. 20 Śabara says a woman owns no wealth, if one follows smṛti, but is owner of property if *śruti* be followed. On IX. 2. 2 Śabara says 'naiṣā smṛtiḥ pramāṇam, dṛṣṭamūlā hyeṣā'; on X. 1.36 Śabara says that from the usage of respectable people smṛti is inferred and from smṛti Śruti text is inferred; on X. I. 42 Śabara says 'Smṛti is stronger than usage'. On X. 3. 47 Śabara says 'there is a smṛti that one should not sell a horse'. In one place Śabara employs the words 'pramāṇāyām smṛtau' instead of 'pramāṇe smṛtau' as one would expect and the Tantravārtika is at great pains to show that this lapse on the part of Śabara may be somehow justified (pp. 183-184) on I. 3. 3. The Baudhāyana Dh. S. (1. 1. 19-26) sets out five practices peculiar to the countries of the South (Southern India) and five others peculiar to the North and says that if one belonging to the South follows any of the usages peculiar to the North and *vice versa* he would be guilty of sin. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. III. p. 858 and note 1663 for the passage from Baud. Dh. S. The objector says[2045] that smṛtis should be

---

2045. धर्मस्य शब्दमूलत्वादशब्दमनपेक्षं स्यात्। अपि वा कर्तृसामान्यात् प्रमाणमनुमानं स्यात्। I. 3. 1-2. The words कर्तृसामान्यात् are explained by the भाष्यकार as कर्तृसामान्यात्स्मृति-वैदिकपदार्थयोः i. e. the people who perform Vedic rites and also observe the Smṛti prescriptions are the same; they would not do so unless they firmly believe that smṛti prescriptions are based on Vedic authority though it may not be possible in every case to point out Vedic passages expressly or impliedly referring to them. मेधातिथि on मनु II. 6 clearly puts it, quoting from his own work called स्मृतिविवेक, the following verse: प्रामाण्यकारणं ह्यस्यं वेदविद्भिः परिग्रहः। तदुक्तं कर्तृसामान्यादनुमानं श्रुतीः प्रति ॥; the words underlined are taken from पू. मी. सू. I. 3. 2. मनुस्मृति (II.7) has 'यः कश्चित्कस्यचिद्धर्मो

(*Continued on next page*)

discarded, since smṛtis were composed by men (i. e. they are *pauruṣeya* and not *apauruṣeya*, as the Veda is) and men are often deluded and forgetful. This is the main basis of the objector. To this the reply is that for prescriptions of the smṛtis, there are passages in the Veda that suggest some of the smṛti rules e. g. that the Aṣṭakā *srāddha* was prevalent long before the smṛtis is indicated by the Vedic mantra 'yām janāḥ pratinandanti'. [2046] The usages about obeying the teacher, about providing cisterns for travellers have a seen purpose, viz. the benefit of others. Even the Veda mentions '*prapā* (Ṛg. IX. 4. 1 'dhanvanniva prapā asi 'meaning' O Agni! thou art like a prapā in a desert'. The Tantravārtika is most exhaustive on this and the following sūtras, differs from the Bhāṣyakāra in many places, finds fault with him and gives alternative matters as the subjects for discussion. He puts forward two theories about smṛti provisions for which it is impossible to suggest Vedic indications. He says (firstly) that Smṛti [2047] prescriptions may be based on lost Vedic śākhās, or (2) they may be based on texts contained in the very parts of the Veda that are available at present. If any one asks 'how is it that they are not found', Kumārila gives the reply: the several branches of the Veda are scattered about (in many distant territories), men are negligent, and the texts are contained in different sections of the Veda; on account of these one cannot point out the texts that are the basis of the smṛtis.

That many Vedic texts were lost or are unavailable now was the view even before the days of the Āp. Dh. S. (I. 4. 12. 10), which states 'rites were promulgated in the Brāhmaṇa texts, but the exact words (of the Brāhmaṇa texts) are lost and have to be inferred from the performance of the rites (or from procedure prescribed in Smṛtis)'. [2048] There was danger in relying on the

---

(*Continued from last page*)

मनुना परिकीर्तितः। स सर्वोभिहितो वेदे सर्वज्ञानमयो हि सः॥'. मेधातिथि, गोविंदराज and some other commentators take सः as referring to Veda, while Kullūka refers it to मनु. Vide H. of Dh. III. p. 828 n. 1612 for another meaning of these words.

2046. The verse यां जनाः प्रतिनन्दन्ति रात्रिं occurs in अथर्ववेद III. 10. 2, आप. म. पा. II. 10. 27. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 828 note 1612.

2047. तेन वरं प्रलीनश्रुत्यनुमानमेव ......। यद्वा विद्यमानशाखागतश्रुतिमूलत्वमेवास्तु। कथमनुपलब्धिरिति चेदुच्यते-शाखानां विप्रकीर्णत्वात्पुरुषाणां प्रमादतः। नानाप्रकरणस्थत्वात् स्मृतेर्मूलं न दृश्यते॥ तन्त्रवा. on I. 3. 1 p. 164, quoted by विश्वरूप in his com. on याज्ञ. I. 7 p. 14 (without name).

2048. ब्राह्मणोक्ता विधयस्तेषामुत्सन्नाः पाठाः प्रयोगादनुमीयन्ते। यत्र प्रीत्युपलब्धितः प्रवृत्तिर्न तत्र शास्त्रमस्ति। आप. ध. सू. I. 4. 12. 10-11.

theory that Smṛtis were based on Vedic texts that are lost (or disappeared), because that very argument might be urged by heterodox sects like the Bauddhas.[2049] Therefore, Kumārila put forward the other theory viz. the basis of smṛtis are texts that are not found in the existing vedic texts because the Vedic *śākhās* are scattered about (as said in the verse quoted above).

This whole subject about Smṛtis according to the views of the Mīmāṁsakas has been dealt with at great length by the author in H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 827–841. Therefore, only a few examples and conclusions may be mentioned here. Śabara himself proposes that PMS I. 3. 4[2050] should form a separate *Adhikaraṇa* by itself and puts forward an important maxim viz. where one can find out or ascribe a visible motive for an act one should not postulate an unseen Vedic text or a transcendental motive.[2051] The result of Śabara's dealing with PMS I. 3. 3–4 is neatly put by the Śāstradīpikā as follow; Smṛti rules that are opposed to Śruti rules and such smṛti provisions as can be shown to have a clear worldly motive are not authoritative or binding, while the rest of smrti texts are authoritative. This doctrine is older than the Āp. Dh S. (I. 4. 10. 12) which provides 'where men act because they find pleasure in doing that act there Śāstra has no scope'. Kumārila does not agree with Śabara. He says that visible and invisible or spiritual motives are often inextricably mixed up. 'Unhusking rice grains' has a visible purpose in order that they may be well boiled and the boiled rice may be offered in a sacrifice. In this act then there is a visible purpose and yet this act is prescribed by the Veda. In a trenchant, finely worded and very accommodating passage redolent of a cosmopolitan outlook and the desire to give even the devil his due, Kumārila examines (in pp. 166–168) all the known classes of Sanskrit works with regard to their usefulness

---

2049. यदि तु प्रलीनशाखामूलता कल्प्येत ततस्तासां बुद्धादिस्मृतीनामपि तद्द्वारा प्रामाण्यं प्रसज्यते। तन्त्रवा. on I. 3. 1 p. 163.

2050. विरोधे त्वनपेक्षं स्यादसति ह्यनुमानम्। हेतुदर्शनाच्च। पू. मी. सू. I. 3. 3–4. There is another reading in I. 3. 3 viz. अनपेक्ष्यम्. Vide तन्त्रवा. p. 193 quoted on p. 833 n. 1622 of vol. III. of H. of Dh.

2051. On I. 3. 2 Śabara says 'ये दृष्टार्थास्ते तत एव प्रमाणं ये त्वदृष्टार्थास्तेषु वैदिकशब्दानुमानम्।'. The तन्त्रवा. on this says 'उपपन्नतरं चैतद् वेदवाक्यानुमानतः। दृष्टे हि सत्यदृष्टस्य कल्पना निष्प्रमाणिका।' (p. 186). Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 837 n. 1628. It appears that कुमारिल thought that Śabara stated his case as merely a counter blast and his own opinion is that a smṛti text which has a visible purpose may still be Vedamūla.

and relation to Veda and ordinary worldly experience. Only a few sentences will be set out here and in the notes. Therefore, he provides that all Smṛtis are authoritative according to the purpose they serve. Those parts of Smṛtis that are concerned with Dharma and Mokṣa have the Veda as their source, while whatever parts of Smṛtis are concerned with wealth (*artha*) and worldly pleasures (*kāma*) are based on worldly practices. The same rule applies to the hortatory passages of *Itihāsa* (the Mahābhārata) and Purāṇas, both of which are often spoken of as Smṛti. The episodes and tales in these two should be taken as *arthavādas*. Then he refers to the descriptions of the divisions of the earth and the vaṁśas (dynastic lists) (both of which are among the subjects treated of in the Purāṇas) and sets out the purposes they might serve. The six Vedāṅgas (grammar, metrics, etymology, astronomy &c.) are useful as kratvartha and puruṣārtha, and Mīmāṁsā and Nyāya (logic) have been established (worked up) from worldly experience by means of *pratyakṣa* (direct perception) and inference based upon the technique evolved by a continuous and unbroken line of learned men; that no single person would have been able to put together for the first time such a large collection of arguments[2052] (as in the Mīmāṁsāśāstra). For the necessity of Nyāya (in the interpretation of the Veda) he relies upon Manu XII. 105-106. Kumārila is prepared to concede that philosophical systems in which are postulated *pradhāna* and *puruṣa* (Sānkhya) or the supreme Lord or atoms (Vaiśeṣika) should be deemed to explain the creation and dissolution of the world, should be looked upon as exhibiting perceived, minute and gross substances divided into causes and effects due to the knowledge derived from *mantras* and *arthavādas*. The purpose of these is to make known the distinction of *svarga* and *yāga* as result and cause. The purpose of the description of creation and dissolution is to show the

---

2052. सर्वत्र च यथा कथंचिल्लोकपङ्क्ति (पक्ति?) सहायोपादानात्मरक्षणमीत्युत्पावादिका दृष्टार्थता भाष्यकारोक्ता शक्या वक्तुम्। न चावघातादीनां वृष्टिकामयागादीनां च दृष्टार्थानामवैदिकत्वम्। तस्मात्सत्यपि दृष्टार्थत्वे सम्भाव्यते वेदमूलत्वं नियमादृष्टसिद्धेरनन्यप्रमाणकत्वात्। तन्त्रवा. p. 166 (on पू. मी. सू. I. 3.2); मीमांसा तु लोकादेव प्रत्यक्षानुमानादिभिरविच्छिन्नसंप्रदायपण्डितव्यवहारैः प्रवृत्ता। न हि कश्चिदपि प्रथममेतावन्तं युक्तिकलापमुपसंहर्तुं क्षमः। एतेन न्यायविस्तरं व्याख्यातम्। तन्त्रवा. p. 167 on I. 3. 2. M. M. Jha in his translation of Tantravārtika (p. 121) translates 'mimāṁsā is based on the Veda, upon ordinary experience &c. But in the Ānan. edition there are no Sanskrit words corresponding to the words underlined. This passage indicates that Kumārila firmly held that many authors had tried their hands at composing sūtra works on Mīmāṁsā before the present P.M.S. emerged.

distinction between the power of luck and human effort. He goes even a step further and is prepared to admit that even heterodox hypotheses of Bauddhas such as the theory that only Vijñāna (cognition) exists, that everything is in an eternal flux and that there is no (permanent) soul, which (theories) sprang from the arthavāda passages in the Upaniṣads, serve the purpose of inducing people to give up extreme attachment to sensual pleasures and are useful and authoritative in their own ways.

He sums up the distinction by stating that as regards those smṛtis (or portions of them) in which the fruit or result promised cannot possibly be experienced in this life, but where the result is promised as fructifying in the remote future (i. e. after death), an inference as to their being based on Veda may be drawn, but, as in the case of scorpion lore[2053] (i. e. incantations for curing the sting of a scorpion), works dealing with matters that can be seen are authoritative only because the result can be perceived in other men similarly stung.

The medieval Dharmaśāstra works take up this discussion about the distinction between smṛtis based upon the Veda and those on perceptible motives or purposes. For example, the Kalpataru (Brahma-cāri-kāṇḍa p. 30) and Aparārka (pp. 626–627) quote verses from Bhaviṣyapurāṇa (Brāhmaparva chap. 181, 22–31) that divide the contents of smṛtis in five categories and exemplify that division. The Sm. C. II. p. 24 quotes two of these and the Paribhāṣāprakāśa of Mitramiśra (p. 19) quotes all of them. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. III. p. 840 note 1634 for all the verses.

Kumārila (pp. 194–196 of Tantravārtika) holds that the passages quoted by Śabara on I. 3. 3 are not really opposed to Veda at all and that the proper subject for discussion under I. 3. 3–4 is the authoritativeness in matters of Dharma of the schools[2054] of Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Pāśupata, Pāñcarātra and Śākyas

---

2053. विज्ञानमात्र–क्षणभङ्ग–नैरात्म्यादिवादानामप्युपनिषदर्थवादप्रभवत्वं विषयेष्वात्यन्तिकं रागं निवर्तयितुमित्युपपन्नं सर्वेषां प्रामाण्यम्। सर्वत्र च यत्र कालान्तरफलार्थत्वादिदानीमनुभवासम्भवस्तत्र श्रुतिमूलता। सान्दृष्टिकफले तु वृश्चिकविद्यादौ पुरुषान्तरे व्यवहारदर्शनादेव प्रामाण्यमिति विवेकसिद्धिः। तन्त्रवा० p. 168 on I, 3. 2.

2054. यान्येतानि त्रयीविद्भिर्न परिगृहीतानि ... सांख्ययोग–पाञ्चरात्र–पाशुपत–शाक्य–ग्रन्थपरिगृहीतधर्माधर्मनिबन्धनानि ... अहिंसासत्यवचनदमदानदयादिश्रुतिस्मृतिसंवादिस्तोकार्थगन्धवासितजीविकाप्रायार्थान्तरोपदेशीनि यानि च बाह्यतराणि म्लेच्छाचारमिश्रकभोजनाचरणनिबन्धनानि तेषामेवैतच्छ्रुतिविरोधहेतुदर्शनाभ्यामनपेक्षणीयत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते। तन्त्रवा. p. 194. Here the reading in the sūtra would have to be अनपेक्ष्यं.

and he holds that all these are outside the pale of the three Vedas and are to be discarded as unauthoritative, although they contain a few matters such as ahiṁsā, truthfulness, self-control, charity and compassion, that agree with Śruti and smṛti. It will have been seen from the above that Kumārila was aware of the emphasis placed by Buddhists on some moral values but he differed from them in many other matters, that he was ready to admit that Buddhist works had some value and he did not preach that they should be burnt or destroyed. Therefore, it appears that his attitude was far from being one of total hatred and persecution of the Buddhists, as alleged by Taranatha cited above on p. 1010 n. 1645.

Śabara explains that *sūtras* 5-7 of P. M. S. I. 3 are[2055] concerned with certain religious acts such as ācamana (sipping water) when one sneezes in the midst of a rite, the wearing of Yajñopavīta (the sacred thread), the use of the right hand alone in all acts. These interfere with the sequence and quick performance of the subordinate items in a religious rite, says the objector. Śabara establishes that there is no substance in the objection. Kumārila feels that Śabara is not right as regards the three instances cited by him. He splits the three sūtras into two *adhikaraṇas* (topics for consideration); sūtras 5 and 6 deal (acc. to Kumārila) with the contention that those precepts of Buddha and other founders of unorthodox sects, such as the construction of monasteries and parks, the insistence on desirelessness (*vairāgya*), the continuous practice of meditation, ahiṁsā, truthfulness, restraint of senses, charity and kindness are such as are laid down also by the Veda, are not opposed to the ideas of *śiṣṭas* and cannot rouse the antipathy of those who know the Vedas and that therefore those parts of the unorthodox systems should be deemed to be authoritative. This contention is repelled by Kumārila with the remark that only 14 (four Vedas, 6 Vedāṅgas, Purāṇas, Nyāya, Mīmāṁsā and Dharmaśāstra) or 18 (adding four Upavedas) have been accepted by the Vedic śiṣṭas as authoritative in matters of Dharma and the works of Bauddhas and other sects are not included therein.[2056] Kumārila gives a telling example viz. milk, though by itself pure and useful,

2055. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 841-844 for details of Śabara's views on P.M.S. I. 3. 5-7 and Kumārila's criticism thereof.

2056. Vide Yāj. I. 3 for the 14 *vidyās* and H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 10 note 17 for the four Upavedas viz. Āyurveda, Dhanurveda, Gāndharvaveda and Arthaśāstra.

becomes useless and unacceptable, when poured into a bag of dog-skin.

Kumārila holds that *sūtra* 7 of PMS I. 3 is an *adhikaraṇa* by itself and is concerned with the authoritativeness of *sadācāra* (the customs and usages of śiṣṭas). His position as elaborated in the Tantravārtika is that those usages alone are authoritative that are not opposed to express Vedic texts, that are practised by śiṣṭas under the belief that they are right conduct (*dharma*) and for which no visible motive (such as pleasure or the satisfaction of desires or the acquisition of wealth) can be predicated. Śiṣṭas are only those that perform the religious rites and duties expressly enjoined by the Veda. The practices traditionally handed down from generation to generation that are observed by śiṣṭas (as defined above) with the conviction that they form part of Dharma must be regarded as Dharma and as leading to heaven. The Tantravārtika remarks that practices do not become authoritative merely by the fact that no visible motive or purpose can be postulated for them; but they become so only when they are observed by śiṣṭas as part of Dharma.[2057] Many activities such as agriculture, service or trade, that are the means of securing wealth and pleasures and such actions as eating sumptuous food, drinking, sleeping on soft beds, possessing a charming house or garden, all of which are common to Āryas and Mlecchas are not deemed by any one to be part of Dharma and it does not follow that because a few actions of śiṣṭas are accepted as Dharma, all their actions are to be looked upon as Dharma. Kumārila quotes the advice that a man should follow the path by which his father, grand-father and other ancestors went, provided it is the path of the good, following which he will not come to harm.[2058]

Very intricate questions arise with regard to the relative force of śruti (Veda), smṛti and *sadācāra* (usages observed by śiṣṭas as defined above and in Manu XII. 109). The Mit. on Yāj. I. 7 (laying down five sources of Dharma viz. śruti, smṛti,

2057. दृष्टकारणहीनानि यानि कर्माणि साधुभिः। प्रयुक्तानि प्रतीयेरन् धर्मत्वेनेह तान्यपि ॥ प्रत्यक्षवेदविहितधर्मक्रियया हि लब्धशिष्टत्वव्यपदेशा यत्परम्परामासमन्यदपि धर्मबुद्ध्या कुर्वन्ति तदपि स्वर्ग्यत्वाद्धर्मरूपमेव। तन्त्रवा. pp. 205-206; vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 843 note 1639 for the whole passage.

2058. येनास्य पितरो याता येन याताः पितामहाः। तेन यायात्सतां मार्गं तेन गच्छन्न रिष्यते ॥ मनु IV. 178 q. by तन्त्रवा. p. 211, where Kumārila adds येषां तु पित्रादिभिरेवार्थो नाचरितः स्मृत्यन्तरप्रतिषिद्धश्च ते तं परिहरन्त्येव। अपरिहरन्तो वा स्वजनादिभिः परिह्रियन्ते।. Vide मेधा. and मिता० on this in H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 857 n. 1661.

sadācāra, and two more) states the general rule that in case of conflict each preceding one is more powerful than each succeeding one. Manu (I. 12) states that, for those who desire to know Dharma, Śruti (Veda) is the highest authority. Therefore, in case of conflict between śruti and smṛti the former prevails. There are a few exceptions even to this clear rule which may be illustrated later on. But where two smṛtis are in conflict, the ordinary rule, following the Ṣoḍaśi-nyāya and the words of Gautama I. 5 (Tulyabalavirodhe vikalpaḥ), should be an option. Many works on Dharmaśāstra must have been composed long before 500 B. C., since Gautama mentions Manu (in 21. 7) and 'ācāryāḥ' (in 3. 35, 4. 18) and Āp. Dh. S. (I. 6. 19. 2-12) mentions no less than nine individual authors' opinions on the single question as to whose food may be eaten. Manu (in III. 16) mentions three views held by four sages on the position of a brāhmaṇa who marries a śūdra wife or has a son or child from her. A striking example of a conflict between smṛtis is the rule of Manu (III. 13), Baud. Dh. S. I. 8. ·2, Viṣṇu Dh. S. 24. 1-4, Vas. I. 25, Pār. Gṛ. I. 4 allowing *anuloma* marriages and permitting a brāhmaṇa to have a śūdra woman as a wife and the emphatic statement of Yāj. I. 56-57 that it does not agree with those that declare that persons of the three higher classes can take a śūdra woman as wife. Later writers of smṛtis and *nibandhas* should have said that on account of this conflict there is an option. But they do not say so. They struck upon various devices to wriggle out of such apparent contradictions. The first device was declared by Bṛhaspati (about 500 A. D.) that the Manusmṛti occupies a pre-eminent position as it correctly represents the sense (the real view) of the Vedas and that a smṛti which is opposed to the teaching of Manu is not held in esteem.[2059] But this was not satisfactory and some other devices were resorted to. One was to insert passages in Manusmṛti itself and in other works opposing what had already been declared as the law. Two examples may be cited. As against Manu III. 13 (referred to immediately above) we find in the extant text (III. 14-19) verses very strongly condemning persons of the three

2059. वेदार्थोपनिबन्धृत्वात् प्रामाण्यं तु मनुस्मृतौ। मन्वर्थविपरीता या स्मृतिः सा न प्रशस्यते॥ बृहस्पति q. by अपरार्क p. 628 on या. II. 21 and by कुल्लूक on मनु I. 1. मनुस्मृति II. 7 (quoted above in note 2045) claims that whatever it says on dharma has all been declared in the Veda. The मनुस्मृति frequently echoes the very words of the Veda; e. g. Manu I. 31 and Ṛg. X. 90. 12, Manu II. 2 and वाज. सं. 40. 2, Manu IX. 8 (about Jāyā) and Ait. Br. 33. 1 (7th gāthā), Manu IX. 32 and Ait. Br. 33. 3 (4th gāthā).

higher *varṇas* taking a śūdra woman as wife. Manu allowed the practice of *niyoga* (in IX. 59–62), but the extant Manusmṛti (IX. 64–68) condemns it in no measured terms. These contradictory statements were known to Bṛhaspati who expressly says that Manu permits *niyoga* and himself forbids[2060] it and assigns a reason viz. that in former ages (Kṛta and Tretā) people practised *tapas* and were endowed with knowledge while in the Dvāpara and Kali ages men have lost the powers possessed by men of the past ages and therefore *niyoga* is forbidden. Yājñavalkya himself proposes (II. 21) that when two smṛtis are in conflict 'reasoning based on the practices of elders was of greater force'. Nārada has a similar rule.[2061] Another device was to declare that the nature of Dharma differed in each of the four yugas and that in the kṛta, tretā, dvāpara and kali ages the Dharmas respectively promulgated by Manu, Gautama, Śaṅkha-Likhita and Parāśara were to prevail.[2062] This also could not solve all difficulties, since medieval commentators and digests found that even what was allowed by Parāśara (such as permitting a brāhmaṇa to eat food at the[2063] house of such śūdras as his dāsa, cowherd, barber, family friend and a cultivator of his land for a half share of the crops, permission for a married woman to re-marry in certain circumstances), came to be disapproved of or condemned by people. Another expedient in cases of conflict among smṛtis was provided by Gobhila viz. where there is a conflict of (smṛti) passages, the opinion of the majority should prevail.[2064]

2060. उक्तो नियोगो मनुना निषिद्धः स्वयमेव तु । युगक्रमादशक्योऽयं कर्तुमन्यैर्विधानतः ॥ बृहस्पति q. by कुल्लूक on मनु IX. 68; two more verses of Bṛhaspati cited by Kullūka are not quoted here.

2061. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 866–867 notes 1682–83 for several renderings and explanations of Yāj. II. 21. Compare 'धर्मशास्त्रविरोधे तु युक्तियुक्तो विधिः स्मृतः ।' नारदस्मृति I. 40.

2062. अन्ये कृतयुगे धर्मास्त्रेतायां द्वापरेऽपरे। अन्ये कलियुगे नृणां युगह्रासानुरूपतः ॥ मनु I. 85. The same verse occurs in शान्तिपर्व 232. 27 (=cr. ed. 224. 26) and in पराशरस्मृति (I. 22) (which reads युगरूपानुसारतः); कृते तु मानवो धर्मस्त्रेतायां गौतमः स्मृतः । द्वापरे शाङ्खलिखितः कलौ पाराशरः स्मृतः ॥ पराशर I. 24 q. by स्मृतिच. I. p. 11.

2063. दास-नापित-गोपाल-कुलमित्रार्धसीरिणः । एते शूद्रेषु भोज्यान्ना यश्चात्मानं निवेदयेत् ॥ पराशरस्मृति XI. 21. Compare याज्ञ I. 166 for about the same words and स्वदासो नापितो गोपः कुम्भकारः कृषीवलः । ब्राह्मणैरपि भोज्यान्नाः पञ्चैते शूद्रयोनयः ॥ देवल q. by अपरार्क on p. 245 on या. I. 168. नष्टे मृते प्रव्रजिते क्लीबे च पतिते पतौ । पञ्चस्वापत्सु नारीणां पतिरन्यो विधीयते ॥ पराशरस्मृति IV. 30, on which परा. मा. II. 1. p. 53 remarks 'अयं च पुनरुद्वाहो युगान्तरविषयः'.

2064. विरोधो यत्र वाक्यानां प्रामाण्यं तत्र भूयसाम् । गोभिलस्मृति q. by मलमासतत्त्व p. 767.

As shown above smṛtis had been composed before 500 B. C. and they continued to be compiled till about 900 or 1000 A. D. i. e. for over 1500 years. Yāj. (I. 4–5) mentions 19 smṛtis including his own. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. I. pp. 132–135 for the enumeration of different numbers of smṛtis in different works. At least a hundred smṛtis if not more can be named. During the long period of over 1500 years vast changes in the religious and social ideas of the Indian people, in their customs and usages had occurred. Buddhism arose, flourished and disappeared from India, the caste system became rigid in the matter of food, marriage and social behaviour; Vedic rites, divinities worshipped and language underwent great transformations, animal sacrifices, though occasionally performed, had ceased to be looked upon as meritorious. The religious literature had therefore to be recast to suit new ideals, new worship and new patrons (viz. the common people who had ceased to follow ancient ritual and worship). Smṛtis reflected the changes in ideas, beliefs, worship and usages that occurred from time to time and naturally gave rise to great conflicts among themselves. At last it appears that the learned men of the 10th and following centuries of the Christian era hit upon the plan of providing that certain customs and practices, though formerly allowed and practised, were harmful in the Kali age. A theory was put forward that great sages came together at the beginning of the Kali age and declared that certain rites, customs and usages, though allowed in past ages, should be prohibited in the Kali age.[2065] The actions prohibited or to be avoided in the Kali age (about 55 in number and therefore called Kalivarjya) have been set out and discussed at length in H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 926–967. It is clear from Medhātithi's bhāṣya on Manu (IX. 112) that long before his time (9th century A. D.) there were writers who had condemned *govadha* (in Madhuparka &c.), *niyoga* and the giving of a larger share to the eldest son and expressed the view that those practices were only allowed in bygone ages.

This subject of *Kalivarjya* requires some serious consideration. Three of the Kalivarjyas are the prohibition of *niyoga*, of

2065. एतानि लोकगुप्त्यर्थं कलेरादौ महात्मभिः। निवर्तितानि कर्माणि व्यवस्थापूर्वकं बुधैः॥ lines 39–40 from the appendix (pp. 1014–1015) to vol. III. (of H. of Dh.); 'तस्मादुद्धार-नियोग-गोवधस्मृतय उपदिष्टा नानुष्ठेयाः।' मेधा. on मनु IX. 112; यथा नियोगधर्मो नो नानुबन्ध्यावधोऽपि च। तथोद्धारविभागोऽपि नैव संप्रति वर्तते॥ q. by मिताक्षरा on या II. 117.

the offering of the *anubandhyā* cow (after avabhṛtha) in Jyotiṣṭoma and of the allotment of the largest share (of ancestral wealth) to the eldest son. All these three were either enjoined or permitted by the Veda. From Ṛg. X. 40. 2 it follows that a sonless widow raised a son for the sake of the spiritual benefit of her husband's soul by sexual intercourse with the husband's brother.[2066] The Tai. S. (III. 1. 9. 4) has two contradictory passages viz. 'Manu divided his wealth among his sons' (without making any distinction among them) and 'therefore they endow the eldest son with (the paternal) wealth' (Tai. S. II. 5. 2. 7). In this last case it may be argued that as two Vedic passages are in conflict there is an option. But from very early times there is a prohibition against allowing the whole ancestral wealth or a major portion of it to the eldest son. Āpastamba quotes both[2067] Vedic passages, holds that equal division among sons is the proper rule and remarks that allowing the eldest son to take the whole or a major portion of ancestral estate is prohibited by the Śāstras. Among actions forbidden in the Kali age but practised in Vedic times some striking ones (apart from the three already cited above) may be mentioned here: (1) being initiated for *Sattras* (which were sacrifices extending from 12 days to 12 years or even more and which could be performed by brāhmaṇas alone); Jaimini[2068] deals with them at some length in VI. 6. 16–32 and other places. It is remarkable that neither Śabara nor Kumārila says anything against Sattradīkṣā as prohibited in Kali. So it was not among generally recognized Kalivarjyas till at least the 8th century A. D. (2) killing of a cow or bull. There were several occasions on which this was

---

2066. को वां शयुत्रा विधवेव देवरं मर्यं न योषा कृणुते सधस्थ आ ॥ ऋ. X. 40. 2. For the treatment of niyoga from ancient times, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 599-607. Some regard this verse as indicating re-marriage and not niyoga. But that does not appear to be correct. Manu (IX. 65) states that niyoga is nowhere mentioned among the mantras relating to marriage nor is the remarriage of a widow referred to in the procedure of marriage. But Gautama and some other sūtrakāras and even Yāj. (I. 68–69) prescribe in detail the procedure and conditions governing niyoga; all writers are entirely silent about the procedure of the re-marriage of widows. Therefore, it has to be said that Ṛg. X. 40. 2 was rightly held by ancient smṛtis as referring to the practice of niyoga.

2067. ज्येष्ठो दायाद इत्येके। ... तच्छास्त्रैर्विप्रतिषिद्धम्। ... मनुः पुत्रेभ्यो दायं व्यभजदित्यविशेषेण श्रूयते। अथापि तस्माज्ज्येष्ठं पुत्रं धनेन निरवसाययन्तीत्येकवच्छ्रूयते। ... सर्वे हि धर्मयुक्ता भागिनः। आप. ध. सू. II. 6. 14. 10-12, 14.

2068. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 1239–1246 for details about Sattras.

done in the Vedic age. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. III. pp. 939–940. As flesh-eating came to be looked down upon, cow-sacrifices became most abhorrent and medieval Kalivarjya texts only register a prohibition which had been acted upon for centuries before them. (3) The employment of cups of wine in the Sautrāmaṇī sacrifice.[2069] Jaimini, Śabara and the Ṭup-ṭīkā of Kumārila describe it and both Śabara and Kumārila refer to the offering of cups of wine in it. Therefore this rite must have become Kalivarjya after Kumārila's day. (4) Offering an animal with the recital of Vedic mantras to the bridegroom, to a guest and in honour of *pitṛs*. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 542–546 for Madhuparka in which a bull or a cow was offered according to the Ait. Br. and Vol. III. pp. 945–46 for this Kalivarjya. Manu (V. 41–44) allows the killing of animals in Madhuparka, in sacrifices and in rites for the *pitṛs* (Manes) and gods and emphasizes that sacrificing an animal as laid down by the Veda is no *hiṁsā* but is *ahiṁsā*. Yāj. (I. 258–260) prescribes the periods of time for which *pitṛs* are gratified by the offering of sacrificial food (such as rice or sesame), various kinds of fish and the flesh of several animals. The Mit. was[2070] constrained to observe that, although Yāj. shows that sacrificial food (rice &c), flesh and honey are offerings in Śrāddha for all *varṇas*, yet (in its day) the rule established by Pulastya should be followed viz. food fit for muni (i. e. rice) should be offered by brāhmaṇas, flesh by kṣatriyas and vaiśyas and honey by śūdras.

According to the Pūrvamīmāṁsā Veda is eternal, self-existent and of absolute authority; one fails to understand how sages could have authority at the beginning of the Kali-yuga to prohibit what the Veda enjoined or permitted. This seems to be a fiction invented to accommodate as Dharma the changes in people's ideas and practices that had occurred. It would have been honest and straightforward if the writers on Dharmaśāstra had

---

2069. For reference to Sautrāmaṇī, vide above p. 1079 note 1750. Jai. III. 5. 14–15 and IV. 3. 29–31 deal with it. The Tai. S. V. 6. 3–4. states 'Agnim citvā sautrāmaṇyā yajeta'. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II, pp. 1224–1228 for a description of this sacrifice, which is a combination of an *iṣṭi* with animal sacrifice. The peculiarity of this rite is that, along with cups of milk, cups of wine are offered to Aśvins, Sarasvatī and Indra.

2070. अत्र यद्यपि मुन्यन्नमांसमध्वादीनि सर्ववर्णानां सामान्येन श्राद्धे योग्यानि दर्शितानि तथापि पुलस्त्योक्ता व्यवस्थादरणीया। मुन्यन्नं ब्राह्मणस्योक्तं मांसं क्षत्रियवैश्ययोः। मधुप्रदानं शूद्रस्य सर्वेषां चाविरोधि यत्॥ इति। मिता. on याज्ञ. I. 260–261.

said that changed circumstances required that the words of the Veda or of the old smṛtis should not be followed. And there is nothing novel or revolutionary in saying this. Both Manu [2071] and Yājñavalkya prescribe that one should not observe but give up, what was (once) deemed to be dharma, if it had become hateful to the people and if it would end in unhappiness and not lead to the attainment of heaven. Even the Mitākṣarā follows this precept of the two smṛtis and expressly says that unequal distribution (at partition) of ancestral wealth, though found in the Śāstras, should not be followed because people had come to hate it. It may be noted that the word used by Yāj. and others is 'lokavidviṣṭa' or 'lokavikruṣṭa' (hated or reviled by the people) and not 'śiṣṭa-vidviṣṭa', the idea being that even if orthodox learned *pandits* insist that people must follow what the Veda and smṛtis declare to be Dharma, common people may give up practices condemned by them or hateful to them. This attitude recognizes the historical facts that practices change in the course of centuries and common people are entitled to ignore the dicta even of the Veda (much more of the smṛtis). To the question why should one not be allowed to marry one's mother's sister or

---

2071. परित्यजेदर्थकामौ यौ स्यातां धर्मवर्जितौ। धर्मं चाप्यसुखोदर्कं लोकविक्रुष्टमेव च॥ मनु. IV. 176; विष्णुपुराण III. 11. 7 reads धर्मपीडाकरौ नृप and विद्विष्ट°; कर्मणा मनसा वाचा यत्नाद् धर्मं समाचरेत्। अस्वर्ग्यं लोकविद्विष्टं धर्म्यमप्याचरेन्न तु॥ याज्ञ. I. 156. Vide विष्णुधर्मसूत्र 71. 17–21 (परिहरेत्) धर्मविरुद्धौ चार्थकामौ लोकविद्विष्टं च धार्म्यमपि।; बृहन्नारदीयपु. I. 24. 12 has the verse कर्मणा मनसा ... चरेन्न तु; सर्वलोकविरुद्धं च धर्ममप्याचरेन्न तु। कूर्म° I. 2. 54. 'विषमो विभागः शास्त्रदृष्टस्तथापि लोकविद्विष्टत्वान्नानुष्ठेयः' मिता. on या. II. 117; on याज्ञ. I. 156 the मिता. says 'धर्म्यं विहितमपि लोकविद्विष्टं लोकाभिशस्तिजननं मधुपर्कगोवधादिकं नाचरेत् यस्मादस्वर्ग्यमग्नीषोमीयवत्स्वर्गसाधनं न भवति।'. Vide also मिता. on या. III. 8, which says about the different days of impurity for sapiṇḍas of the 4th, 5th, 6th or 7th degree prescribed by a Smṛti that it should be discarded 'तद्विगीतत्वान्नादरणीयम्। यद्यप्यविगीतं तथापि मधुपर्काङ्गपश्वालम्भनवल्लोकविद्विष्टत्वान्नानुष्ठेयम्।'; the स्मृतिच. (I. p. 71) says 'न क्रमः शास्त्रतो न परिणेयेति किंतु लोकविरुद्धत्वात्। यच्च धर्म्यमपि लोकविरुद्धं तन्नानुष्ठेयम्। यदुक्तं मनुना – अस्वर्ग्यं°;। वराहमिहिरोपि लोकाचारस्तावदादौ विचिन्त्यो देशे देशे या स्थितिः सैव कार्या'॥. Vide above p. 555 note 825 b for this verse which is there quoted from राजमार्तण्ड. The शतपथब्राह्मण (III. 4. 1–2) has 'तस्मै (सोमाय) एतद्यथा राज्ञे वा ब्राह्मणाय वा महोक्षं महाजं वा पचेत्तदह मानुषं हविर्देवानामेवमस्मा एतदातिथ्यं करोति.' वसिष्ठधर्मसूत्र (4. 8) and याज्ञ I. 109 have the same provision as in Śatapatha. Medieval writers could not subscribe to this practice. Viśvarūpa says that an ox or goat is killed only if the guest desires it. कल्पतरु (नियतकाल section p. 190) quotes both वसिष्ठ and याज्ञ° and remarks अत्र गृहागतश्रोत्रियतुष्ट्यर्थं गोवधः कर्तव्य इति प्रतीयते तथापि कलियुगे नायं धर्मः किं तु युगान्तरे, while the मिता. explains "उपकल्पयेत्, भवदर्थमयमस्माभिः परिकल्पित इति तत्प्रीत्यर्थं न तु दानाय व्यापादनाय वा, 'अस्वर्ग्यं ... न तु' इति निषेधाच्च."

mother's sister's daughter if a maternal uncle's daughter can be married, the Smṛticandrikā replies 'we do not say that she could not be married according to Śāstra, but she should not be married as people abhor such a marriage' and it quotes Yāj. I. 156 (by oversight it ascribes the verse to Manu). In modern times when any change or reform in religious or social practices is suggested, Paṇḍits calling themselves *Sanātanis* put forward the pleas that the proposed change or reform is opposed to the śāstras, that the controversy should be carried on according to the Mīmāṁsā rules, that all Smṛti and other dicta should be so construed as to lead to *samanvaya* (consistent arrangement of apparently discordant texts), that the historical approach leads nowhere and should not be resorted to. All these objections are here briefly dealt with. It has been shown how from Vedic times to the present day great changes have taken place in religious ideas, worship and practices, how smṛtis from Gautama, Āpastamba, Manu downwards espouse conflicting views so much so that as early as the Mahābhārata Vyāsa [2072] had to protest that 'rationalisation is unstable, Vedas are in conflict with each other, there is no single sage whose opinion is held to be authoritative (by all), the truth about Dharma is enveloped in a cave (i. e. it cannot be clearly discerned) and that therefore the path (to be followed) is the one followed by the great mass of people.' The Mīmāṁsā does not often lead to certain conclusions and it has already been seen how great Mīmāṁsā writers like Śabara, Kumārila, Prabhākara differ among themselves on numerous topics and it would be further illustrated later on how even great Mīmāṁsakas evolve highly conflicting conclusions in the interpretation of simple smṛti passages. Change is the one absolute in the long history of our religious and social ideas and what those who appeal to the historical approach mean is that the smṛtis were composed by human authors during a period of 1500 or 2000 years and were greatly influenced by the then prevailing religious and social atmosphere, that many of their dicta cannot be fully reconciled *so as to form a consistent code of conduct*, that they *cannot be*

2072. तर्कोऽप्रतिष्ठः श्रुतयो विभिन्ना नैको मुनिर्यस्य मतं प्रमाणम्। धर्मस्य तत्त्वं निहितं गुहायां महाजनो येन गतः स पन्थाः॥ वनपर्व chap. 313. 117 (in यक्षप्रश्न). But this verse does not occur in the Cri. ed. of वनपर्व chap *297*, though several other questions and answers do occur. The words 'महा... पन्थाः' may also mean the path to be followed is the one that some great man (or men) takes; महाजन in the sense of 'mass of people' is employed by शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. IV. *2.7* in the words 'एवमियमप्युत्क्रान्तिर्महाजनगतैवाङ्कीत्यर्थे'.

regarded as forever binding on all Hindus, that in the 20th century our people are free to introduce or recognize such changes as are required or have already taken place among the people in the changed circumstances and that this course is sanctioned even by Manu and Yājñavalkya and medieval eminent authors and works on the Dharmaśāstra such as the Mitākṣarā and the Kalpataru. It is of course clear that changes in practices and principles should not be made merely for the sake of change or for the whims of some leader, but the governing principle of conscious change should be the feelings and needs of common people, while retaining the foundations on which society has been based for thousands of years.

It has further to be noted that the Mīmāṁsā rules were concerned only with the interpretation of the Vedic passages on sacrificial rites and matters relating thereto and had very little to do with the practices of people unconnected with sacrifices or religious rites.[2073] The Mīmāṁsāsūtra nowhere says that the same rules should be applied to the interpretation of smṛtis. On the contrary, the P. M. S. is very critical about smṛtis and usages (vide P. M. S. I. 3. 3-4 and 7). There are fundamental differences between the Veda and the smṛtis. The Veda was deemed to be self-existent, eternal and of absolute authority, while smṛtis are pauruṣeya (works of human authors), have only a derived authority (as being presumed to be based on Vedic passages most of which are not now available), their number is

---

2073. For an example, where Dharmaśāstra refused to allow the application of Mīmāṁsā rules to vratas and utsavas vide above p. 133 n. 337. For examples of medieval digests and commentaries saying that certain inconvenient smṛti texts referred to previous Kalpas and Yugas, vide Sm. C. I. 24 and Par. M. I 2 p. 83 about Hārīta speaking of Upanayana for women (H. of Dh, Vol. II, p. 295); Par. M. I. part 2 p. 97 refers to Manu III, 13 allowing the marriage of a brāhmaṇa with a śūdra woman and III. 14 forbidding it and to Yāj. quoted above in note 2071 and remarks that this conflict is to be resolved by saying that there is difference of opinion among smṛtis on that point or that they refer to different yugas. Vide also above p 89 n. 222 on the divergence about Yugādi Tithis. The V. M. (P. 99 of my edition, Poona, 1926) states that the verse of Nārada which says 'as to those sons who are separated by their father himself by giving to each of them less or more, it is their duty to abide by it since the father has power over all' is declared as referring to another Yuga. Vide also V. M. pp. 242–243 about killing an *ātatāyin* brāhmaṇa अतः कलौ स्ववधोद्यतोऽप्याततायी विप्रो न वध्यः। युगान्तरे तु वध्य एव।. This conclusion is due to the verse in कलिवर्ज्य section 'आततायिद्विजाग्र्याणां धर्मयुद्धेन हिंसनम्। ... इमान् धर्मान् कलियुगे वर्ज्यानाहुर्मनीषिणः॥.'

very large, they often differ so much from each other that even eminent authors and works like the Mitākṣarā had sometimes to give up in despair the idea of bringing order out of the welter of smṛti passages and in their efforts at *samanvaya* had to say that certain smṛtis refer to a former Kalpa or Yuga (i. e. to a society of several thousands or millions of years ago). One of the well-known maxims of the P. M. S. is the one called 'Sarvaśākhāpratyayanyāya'[2074] or 'Śākhāntarādhikaraṇanyāya' (II. 4. 8–33). In the several recensions of the Veda and the Brāhmaṇas attached to the Vedic recensions the same rite is mentioned and is dilated upon with details some of which occur in one or more recensions but are absent from others. Jaimini and Śabara establish that all the Śākhās of the Veda and the Brāhmaṇas form one *corpus*, that such rites as Agnihotra and Jyotiṣṭoma are one and the same in all recensions of the Veda, though the details may vary here and there, and this is the proper conclusion because the name (Jyotiṣṭoma and the like) is the same in all recensions, the promised reward of the rite is the same, the materials of the sacrifice and the *devatā* are the same and the *codanās* (the exhortatory sentences) are the same. This very maxim was extended to smṛtis from very early times. Viśvarūpa, Medhātithi, the Mitākṣarā,[2075] Aparārka and other commentators extend this to smṛtis and provide that where smṛtis are in conflict there is to be an option but that in other cases all the details are to be added up. But as an option was liable to eight faults the tendency developed that all smṛti passages on a topic were to be so interpreted as to give no rise to conflict or to allow no option by means of various devices

---

2074. एकं वा संयोगरूपचोदनाख्याविशेषात्। पू. मी. सू. II. 4. 9; शबर says 'सर्वशाखाप्रत्ययं सर्वब्राह्मणप्रत्ययं चैकं कर्म' on जै. II. 4. 9 pp. 635–636; the तन्त्रवा. p. 635 remarks 'एकस्यामपि शाखायां ब्राह्मणानेकत्वेपि तदेव कर्मेत्यभिप्रायः। यथोद्गातॄणां पञ्चविंश-षड्विंश-ब्राह्मणयोर्ज्योतिष्टोमद्वादशाहौ॥.' Compare सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययं चोदनाद्यविशेषात्। वे. सू. III. 3 1.

2075. Vide विश्वरूप on या. I. 4–5 'न तावदाम्नायो धर्मशास्त्रभेदप्रतिपादकः, न चैतत्प्रभवो न्यायः। अपि तु श्रौतानां कृत्स्नोपसंहारात् तत्पूर्वकत्वाच्च तथैवात्रापि प्राप्नोति।'; vide मेधा० on मनु II. 29; 'एवमन्येष्वपि विकल्प आश्रयणीयः, अविरोधिषु समुच्चयः। शाखान्तराधिकरणन्यायेन सर्वस्मृतिप्रत्ययत्वात्कर्मणः।' मिता. on याज्ञ. III. 325; vide अपरार्क pp. 1053 q. on p. 89 n 211 of vol. IV. and also p. 1102, स्मृतिच. I. p 5, मद. पा. pp. 11, 91, शुद्धितत्त्व pp. 378–380, जलाशयोत्सर्गतत्त्व p. 523. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 72 and H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 89–90 and 453–455 for explanations and illustrations of this maxim. The Mit. on Yāj. I. 4–5 provides 'एतेषां (धर्मशास्त्राणां) प्रत्येकं प्रामाण्येपि साकाङ्क्षाणामाकाङ्क्षापरिपूरणमन्यतः क्रियते विरोधे विकल्पः' q. in I.L.R. 39 Bom. 373 at p. 379.

such as 'Viṣaya-vyavasthā', reference to another Kalpa or Yuga and so on. For example, even as regards the stock example of *vikalpa* (viz. taking or not taking the Ṣoḍaśin cup in Atirātra) the Mit. says that it is proper to assume that it should be taken if it is possible to do so, or it may be assumed that by taking the Ṣoḍaśin cup in Atirātra the attainment of *svarga* is hastened &c.[2076] The result of regarding all smṛtis as constituting one Śāstra was that many simple rites became in course of time overloaded with details, complicated and taxing to the performer. But sometimes it is necessary to apply this doctrine. For example, Yāj. I. 135 requires the *snātaka* not to look at the sun (nekṣetārkam); this would mean that to look at the sun is prohibited at all times, but the dictum of Yāj. should be read along with Manu IV. 37 which forbids a person to look at the rising or setting sun or at the sun when eclipsed or as reflected in water or when it is at the meridian. So the rule will be as stated by Manu.

While on this subject of the authoritativeness of Smṛtis it would be useful to glance at what Jaimini and particularly Kumārila say about the Vedāṅgas. As regards Śikṣā (Phonetics) Kumārila says that the account given in that work about the organs employed in pronunciation and the rules about Vedic accents have their use in the correct recitation of *mantras*. On the Kalpa-sūtras Jaimini[2077] has a separate *adhikaraṇa* (I. 3. 11–14). Śabara mentions by name the Māśaka, Hāstika and Kauṇḍinyaka Kalpasūtras and the Tantravārtika draws a distinction between *kalpa* (ritual of Śrauta sacrifices) and Kalpasūtras, and refers by name to eight.

These sūtras (PMS I. 3. 11–14) have been interpreted by Kumārila in several different ways, firstly as referring to the authoritativeness of Kalpasūtras (as done by Śabara), secondly

---

2076. न च षोडशिग्रहणाग्रहणवद्विषमयोरपि विकल्पोपपत्तिरिति वाच्यं, यतस्तत्रापि सति सम्भवे ग्रहणमेवेति युक्तं कल्पयितुम् । यद्वा षोडशिग्रहणानुगृहीतेनातिरात्रेण क्षिप्रं स्वर्गादिसिद्धिरतिशयितस्य वा स्वर्गस्येति कल्पनीयम्। मिता० on याज्ञ. III. 243.

2077. के पुनः कल्पाः कानि सूत्राणीति उच्यते। सिद्धरूपः प्रयोगो यः कर्मणामनुगम्यते। ते कल्पा लक्षणार्थानि सूत्राणीति प्रचक्षते। कल्पनाद्धि प्रयोगाणां कल्पोऽनुष्ठानसाधनम्। सूत्रं तु सूचनात्तेषां स्वयं कल्प्यप्रयोगकम्। कल्पाः पठितसिद्धा हि प्रयोगाणां प्रतिक्रतु। तन्त्रवा० on I. 3.11 (प्रयोगशास्त्रमिति चेत्) p. 229. The principal distinction is that Kalpas about each vedic sacrifice lay down simply the procedure that is ready made as handed down by oral tradition, while Kalpasūtras like those of Āśvalāyana, Baijavāpi, Drāhyāyaṇa, Lāṭyāyana and Kātyāyana contain *saṁjñās*, *paribhāṣās*, general rules, exceptions and definitions etc.

as referring to all the six Vedāṅgas and thirdly as referring to the so-called smṛtis of Buddha and others. That the Buddhist works claimed to be smṛtis is clear from the Manusmṛti [2078] 'the smṛtis that are beyond the pale of the Veda and whatever other false systems may exist, they are all fruitless as to the (soul's) Hereafter (destiny after bodily death), since they are all based on *tamas* (ignorance).' Here some words will be said about the Vedāṅgas according to Kumārila. According to both Śabara and Kumārila, vyākaraṇa is dealt with in Jaimini I. 3. 24–29. In the Tantravārtika Kumārila launches an elaborate and telling (pūrvapakṣa) onslaught against Pāṇini himself, aganist Kātyāyana (the author of the Vārtikas) and Patañjali (author of the Mahābhāṣya) in which some very interesting points are made but they have to be passed over for reasons of space. Kumārila says that the proper subject of grammar is to determine what words are correct or incorrect. It is intersting to note that in the *prima facie* attack against grammar two Pūrvamīmāṁsā sūtras are said to offend against grammar. [2079]

The Nirukta of Yāska, which is one of the six *aṅgas* of the Veda, is an extensive work and deals with the derivation of words, semantics, explanations of several hundred Vedic verses in whole or in part. Jaimini agrees with several conclusions of the Nirukta, which claims that without its help one cannot understand the meaning of the Veda, that it has a purpose of its own and is a complement of grammar, and it controverts at great length the view of Kautsa [2080] that Vedic mantras have no meaning

---

2078. या वेदबाह्याः स्मृतयो याश्च काश्च कुदृष्टयः। सर्वास्ता निष्फलाः प्रेत्य तमोमूला हि ताः स्मृताः॥ मनुस्मृति XII. 95.

2079. गव्यस्य च तदादिषु। पू. मी. सू. VIII. 1. 18; here गव्य is employed in the sense of गवामयन sacrifice; द्यावोस्तथेति चेत्। पू. मी. सू. IX. 3. 18. Here द्यावोः stands for द्यावापृथिव्योः. On these the तन्त्रवा. (p. 259) remarks 'तथा मीमांसायामपि–गव्यस्य च तदादिषु इति गोर्विकारावयवविषयसाधुप्रयोगयोग्यः शब्दोऽन्यत्रैव गवामयने प्रयुक्तः। तथा द्यावोस्तथेति चेत्– इति द्यावापृथिव्योरिति वक्तव्ये लक्षणहीनमेव बहु प्रयुक्तम्।'. Śabara quotes the Mahābhāṣya several times and refers to Pātañjali as ācārya and abhiyukta. Vide the present author's paper on the 'Mahābhāṣya and the bhāṣya of Śabara in the Journal, Bhāratīya Vidyā, vol. VI. pp. 43–45 (1945) and 'citations from Śabara' by Prof. D. V. Garge in the Deccan College Dissertation series No. 8 (1952), pp. 239–242 for Śabara's quotations from the Mahābhāṣya.

2080. अथापीदमन्तरेण मन्त्रेष्वर्थप्रत्ययो न विद्यते तदिदं विद्यास्थानं व्याकरणस्य कार्त्स्न्यं स्वार्थसाधकं च। यदि मन्त्रार्थप्रत्ययायानर्थकं भवतीति कौत्सोऽनर्थका हि मन्त्राः।... अर्थवन्तः शब्दसामान्यादेतद्वै यज्ञस्य समृद्धं यद्रूपसमृद्धं यत्कर्म क्रियमाणमृग्यजुर्वाभिवदतीति

(*Continued on next page*)

(or purpose) and emphatically asserts that Vedic mantras have a meaning (and a purpose) because the words they contain are the same as those employed in popular speech and that a Brāhmaṇa passage states that sacrifice has a perfect form when a ṛk verse or yajus formula refers to the rite that is being performed. Jaimini (in I. 2. 4. ff and I. 3. 30) holds that Mantras are meaningful and that Vedic words and words in popular Sanskrit are the same and the things denoted by them both are the same (except that some difference may be caused by accentuation in the Veda).[2081] The very first sentence of Śabara's bhāsya says the same thing. Jaimini further[2082] agrees with the Nirukta about the denotation of verbs and nouns. Śabara frequently quotes either the very words of the Nirukta or pointedly refers to them.[2083] Jaimini agrees with the Nirukta in the matter of the nature and functions of the Devatās in sacrifices.[2084]

(Continued from last page)

यं ब्राह्मणम्। निरुक्त I. 15. The word विद्यास्थाने which is employed by Yāj. also (I. 3) may be noted. Vide notes 1780–81 for the passage एतद्वै ... वदति. The Ait. Br. (chap. III. 5) states that 13 verses are repeated at the time of producing fire by attrition and examines them to show how they are रूपसमृद्ध. All that it says on these 13 verses is not quite convincing, but in the case of several of them such as Ṛg VI. 16.13–15 it is convincing; vide 'Our Heritage' (Calcutta Sanskrit College) vol. V. part 2 (for July–December 1957) for a lengthy paper 'on the justification of rūpasamṛddha verses in the Ait. Br.' by Vimana Chandra Bhattacharya (pp. 119–146).

2081. लोके येष्वर्थेषु प्रसिद्धानि पदानि सति सम्भवे तदर्थान्येव सूत्रेष्वित्यवगन्तव्यम्। ... एवं वेदवाक्यान्येवैभिर्व्याख्यायन्ते। शाबरभाष्य, first sentence.

2082. Compare भावप्रधानमाख्यातं सत्त्वप्रधानानि नामानि। निरुक्त I. 1 with जै. II. 1. 1 'भावार्थाः कर्मशब्दास्तेभ्यः क्रिया प्रतीयेतैष ह्यर्थो विधीयते।.'

2083. Vide for example, शबर on जै. IV. 3. 38 p. 1267 (the verse अङ्गादङ्गात् occurring in निरुक्त III. 4 which cites it as a ṛk; शबर on जै. VI. 2.13, p. 1396 (एवं तस्याख्यातस्यार्थमुपदिशन्ति—उपक्रमप्रभृत्यपवर्गपर्यन्तमाहेति उपक्रमाद्धारभ्य यावत्परिसमाप्तिरित्येतावान् व्यापारविशेषस्तस्यार्थो न यथा पाकस्याग इति, which quotes the words in निरुक्त I. 1); शबर on जै. X. 4. 23 p. 1927 (the words अतिथिदेवत्यं पितृदेवत्यमिति that occur in निरुक्त VII. 5), शबर on जै. X. 4. 34 p. 1935 (न ह्यत्र 'स्वरसंस्कारौ ...गुणेनान्वितौ' भवतः, which occur in निरुक्त II. 1 in the first sentence); शबर on जै. X. 8. 35. quotes the verse यमेव विद्याः occurring in निरुक्त II. 4 and remarks that एव should be placed after शुचिम् 'यं शुचिमेव विद्या इति वक्तव्ये यमेव विद्याः शुचिमिति.

2084. Compare निरुक्त VII. 6–7 with जैमिनि IX. 1. 9 अपि वा शब्दपूर्वत्वाद्यज्ञकर्म प्रधानं स्याद्गुणत्वे देवताश्रुतिः; शबर on this has several phrases like पौरुषविधिकैरङ्गैः (शबर p. 1654, निरुक्त VII. 7), which appear to be taken from the निरुक्त.

Kumārila makes a general remark that all the six aṅgas and the Dharmaśāstras are comprehended under Smṛti.[2085]

It appears that Jaimini did not attach much importance to Smṛtis, since out of 915 (or 1000) Adhikaraṇas barely about a dozen are concerned in any way with smṛtis alone, viz. I. 3. 1–2, I. 3. 3-4, I. 3. 11–14, I. 3. 24–29, VI. 2. 21–22, VI. 2. 30, VI. 8. 23–24, VII. 1. 10, IX. 2. 1–2, XII. 4. 43. Śabara, however, refers to smṛtis in many more places such as on VI. I. 5 and 13, IX. 1. 6–9.

We are here concerned with the attitude of Jaimini and his early commentators like Śabara and Kumārila towards Smṛtis. The established conclusion arrived at by Jaimini (in I. 3. 2) is that in case of conflict with the Veda Smṛti is to be discarded, but if there be no conflict (of Smṛti with Veda), it may be inferred (that Smṛti is based on some Vedic text).

This amounts to saying that there is always a presumption that smṛtis are based on Veda, if their prescriptions are not directly in conflict with the Veda. Smṛtis prescribe the observance of Aṣṭakā śrāddhas, the digging of tanks, following and obeying a teacher. These are authoritative because they do not conflict with any Vedic text of opposite import. The Smṛtis do claim that they are based on the Veda. Gautama says so (in XI. 19 in note 2042) and Manu states (II. 7) 'whatever Dharma is proclaimed by Manu for anybody has all been (already) declared in the Veda, since Veda possesses all knowledge'.

In connection with smṛtis and usages an important question arises viz. if there is conflict between smṛtis and usages of śiṣṭas, which is to be regarded as more authoritative. Kumārila holds that if the practice of good men is not opposed to what is taught in the Veda and Smṛti, such practices can be understood to be authoritative but if there is contradiction between what is taught by Veda and by Smṛti and by usages, then their authoritativeness would be opposed (i. e. would be lost) and further that[2086] smṛti is more authoritative because it is based directly

---

2085. स्मृतित्वं त्वङ्गानां धर्मसूत्राणां चाविशिष्टम्। तन्त्रवा. p. 285 on I. 3. 27.

2086. शिष्टं यावच्छ्रुतिस्मृत्योस्तेन यत्न विरुध्यते। तच्छिष्टाचरणं धर्मे प्रमाणत्वेन गम्यते। यदि शिष्टस्य कोपः स्याद्विरुध्येत प्रमाणता। तदकोपात्तु नाचारप्रमाणत्वं विरुध्यते॥ तन्त्रवा. on I. 3. 8 p. 216 and again on p. 220 'उभयोः श्रुतिमूलत्वं न स्मृत्याचारयोः समम्। सप्रत्ययप्रणीता हि स्मृतिः सोपनिबन्धना। तथा श्रुत्यनुमानं हि निर्विघ्नमुपजायते। आचारात्तु स्मृतिं ज्ञात्वा श्रुतिर्विज्ञायते ततः। तेन द्व्यन्तरितं तस्य प्रामाण्यं विप्रकृष्यते॥.' प्रत्यय means ज्ञानं विश्वासो वा (as Manu and others were sages).

on the Veda, while in the case of usages, one has to infer that śiṣṭas must have based their conduct on some smṛti, which in its turn has to be deemed to be based on some Vedic text i. e. usage is removed from the Veda by one step further than Smṛtis and besides it is well-known that smṛtis are compositions by persons who were deeply versed in the Veda, while the origins of usages are vague and unascertainable.

Though this is the theoretical rule, supported by Dharmaśāstra works such as Vas. I. 5, Mit. on Yāj. I. 7 and II. 117, Kullūka on Manu II. 10, one finds that usages opposed to smṛtis have been in vogue from ancient times (such as the usage of marrying one's maternal uncle's daughter that is condemned by Manu and authoritative smṛtis). The Vyavahāramayūkha (p. 98 of the text in B. G. S.) was constrained to observe that in the Purāṇas one often finds usages opposed to smṛtis. The courts have held that 'immemorial usage is transcendental law' and that this is the translation by Sir William Jones of 'ācāraḥ paramo dharmaḥ' in Manu I. 108. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. III. pp 874–876 for two interpretations of this verse of Manu I. 108 in modern times. Manu in (II. 10) asserts that Veda and smṛti are in all matters not to be subjected to (hostile) reasoning, since Dharma shone forth from these two. Manu further provided that as regards matters not specifically provided for, whatever brāhmaṇas that have studied the Veda together with the supporting lores (viz. the six aṅgas, mīmāṁsā, Purāṇas &c.) and that make others realize what Śruti says are śiṣṭas and whatever they declare to be the Dharma in such unprovided cases is undoubtedly the Dharma.

It was declared by the Privy Council that 'under the Hindu system of law clear proof of usage will outweigh the written text of the law.'[2087] From very ancient times customs and usages have been held to be authoritative. For example, Gautama XI. 20 says 'the usages of countries, castes and families are authoritative, provided they are not (directly) opposed to Vedic texts.' Manu I. 118 states that he has embodied in his Śāstra the long-standing customs and usages of countries, castes, families, heretical sects and guilds. In some matters

2087. In Collector of Madura v. Mootoo Ramlinga, 12 M. I. A. 397 at p. 436 the Privy Council say so.

modern legislation in India allows to customs and usages over-riding [2088] authority.

In the examination of certain Kalivarjyas mentioned above, (p. 1268-1270) it has been shown how several actions prohibited in the Kalivarjya texts were practised in Vedic times or were enjoined by Vedic texts.

Kumārila points out that even brāhmaṇa women of Ahicchatrā and Mathurā drank [2089] liquor in his day, that northern brāhmaṇas engage in such transactions as the gift and sale of horses that have a mane, of mules, camels and animals that have two rows of teeth and eat from the same plate with their wives, children and friends, that brāhmaṇas of the South enter into matrimony with the maternal uncle's daughter and take their meals while seated on a couch of wickerwork, that both (brāhmaṇas of the North and South) take cooked food (kept in pots) that remains after their friends or relatives have partaken of it or that has been touched by them (at the time of eating), that they chew *tāmbūla* of betel leaves, betelnut, catechu and lime made into a roll that has been touched (in a betel-seller's shop) and do not sip water at the end of the chewing, wear clothes cleaned by washermen and brought on the back of asses, that they do not avoid the contact of persons guilty of grave sins except of the murder of a brāhmaṇa; there are also an infinite number of obvious violations of the subtle dictates of Dharma laid down for each man, caste or family, that these (transgressions) are contrary to Śruti and Smṛti and have a visible purpose and that it is not possible to regard such adulterated practices as Dharma inculcated by *sadācāra*. The requisites of valid usages according to the Pūrvamīmāṁsā school are that they must be ancient, not opposed to the express texts of the Veda or of Smṛti, must be such as are deemed by śiṣṭas to be obligatory and must

2088. For example, the Hindu Marriage Act (25 of 1955) by section 5 provides that the parties to a marriage must not be within the degrees of prohibited relationship and must not be *sapiṇḍas* of each other and yet adds 'unless the custom or usage governing each of them permits of a marriage between the two'.

2089. For the original text of this interesting passage of the Tantravārtika, vide H. of Dh. Vol. III. p. 848 note 1645; for different views on marrying a maternal uncle's daughter vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp 458-463; for eating from the same plate with wife and children, vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. p. 765, and about gift or sale of horses and animals with two rows of teeth, vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. p. 181 and Jai. III. 4. 28-31.

be observed by them with the consciousness that they are so, they must not have a visible purpose and must not be immoral. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. III. p. 853-855 for discussion on valid customs and usages.

The general rules laid down by Dharmaśāstra works about the binding character of customs and usages are in line with the rules of the Pūrvamīmāṃsā. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. III. pp. 871-884. But deviation from Vedic texts and smṛtis gradually arose as noted above.

Even all actions done by great men cannot be called *sadācāra*, according to Kumārila, if they can be attributed to greed or some such base motive and should not be looked upon as Dharma. Gautama,[2090] Āp. Dh. S. and the Bhāgavata-purāṇa remark that even great men were guilty of violations of Dharma and defiant excesses, that those great men incurred no sin (got over the effects of such violations) on account of their being endowed with eminent *tapas* (spiritual merit due to austerities) but that others of later ages following their examples and treading the same path would sink (into hell). Kumārila cites twelve such instances of lapses, explains them away or says they were due to wrath or other passions and were not intended by the authors (of those acts) as dharma and are not looked upon as śiṣṭācāra by modern men. The twelve instances are: Prajāpati who became enamoured of his own daughter (Uṣas, explains Kumārila), Indra is described as the jāra (paramour) of Ahalyā (night, according to Kumārila's explanation); Vasiṣṭha through grief for the slaughter of his hundred sons by a demon contemplated suicide; Viśvāmitra who became officiating priest to Triśaṅku that had become a cāṇḍāla through a curse; Nahuṣa who, when he occupied the position of Indra, made approaches to Śacī, wife of Indra and was transformed into an *ajagara* (huge reptile); Purūravas, when separated from Urvaśī, thought of dying (by hanging &c.); Kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana who was *naiṣṭhika* (perpetual) brahmacārin raised sons on the widows of his uterine brother, Vicitravīrya; Bhīṣma, though unmarried, performed Aśvamedha sacrifices; Dhṛtarāṣṭra, though congenitally blind, performed

---

2090. दृष्टो धर्मव्यतिक्रमः साहसं च महताम्। अवरदौर्बल्यात्। गौ I. 3-4; दृष्टो धर्मव्यतिक्रमः साहसं च पूर्वेषाम्। तेषां तेजोविशेषेण प्रत्यवायो न विद्यते। तदन्वीक्ष्य प्रयुञ्जानः सीदत्यवरः। आप. ध. सू. II. 6. 13. 7-9; vide भागवत X. Pūrvārdha 33. 30 धर्मव्यतिक्रमो दृष्ट ईश्वराणां च साहसम्। तेजीयसां न दोषाय वह्नेः सर्वभुजो यथा. That by prāṇāyāma and other practices the impurities of the senses and mind are cleared away is stated by Manu VI. 71.

sacrifices which blind men are not authorised to do (compare Jai. VI. I. 42); five Pāṇḍavas marrying one Draupadī; Yudhiṣṭhira who prevaricated and thereby caused the death of Droṇa, his brāhmaṇa guru; Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna are described in the Mahābhārata as drunk with wine ('ubhau madhvāsavakṣibau dṛṣṭau me Keśavārjunau' in Udyogaparva 59. 5) and married their maternal uncle's daughters; Rāma performed Aśvamedha by associating a golden image of Sītā with him.

Kumārila displays great ingenuity in explaining away most of these transgressions by plausible and specious arguments, by relying on the great *tapas* in some cases (such as about Viṣvāmitra) and in some cases by downright denial (as in the case of Subhadrā being the sister of Kṛṣṇa).[2091] Those interested may refer for all these instances and their explanations by Kumārila to H. of Dh. Vol. III. pp. 845–848.

One interesting *adhikaraṇa* is the Holākādhikaraṇa (Jai. I. 3. 15–23). It is said that Holākā should be observed by the easterners, Āhnīnaibuka by Southerners, Udvṛṣabhayajña by northerners. The established conclusion is that such observances are meant for all (and not merely for persons of the East or South &c.), if they are fit to be done by[2092] easterners or southerners (there is no reason why these should not be observances fit for all). The general rule about Vedic vidhis is that they are applicable to all Āryas; no cogent reason exists why a restricted Vedic text should be inferred in the case of the above observances. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. III. pp. 851–853 for detailed explanation of this maxim and above pp. 237 ff. The Dāyabhāga (II. 40 and VI. 22–23) refers to this maxim in connection with a double share to be allotted to the acquirer and with reference to a person acquiring property without detriment to the ancestral estate and explains the purpose of the Holākādhikaraṇa.

The Holākādhikaraṇanyāya is frequently mentioned by writers on Dharmaśāstra. Viśvarūpa on Yāj. I. 53 quotes the

---

2091. The आदिपर्व expressly says about सुभद्रा 'दुहिता वसुदेवस्य वासुदेवस्य च स्वसा। आदिपर्व 219. 18 (cr. ed. chap. 211. 18). The मीमांसाकौस्तुभ of खण्डदेव states 'एवमर्जुनस्य मातुलकन्यकायाः सुभद्रायाः परिणयेऽपि सुभद्राया वसुदेवकन्यात्वस्य साक्षात् क्वचिदप्यश्रवणात्।' (p. 48, Chowkhamba S. S. 1924). This is a sample of what to expect from some orthodox Sanskrit writers, when hard pressed by facts contrary to their pet theories or views.

2092. न्यायविदश्च याज्ञिकाः—अपि वा ... विधानस्य-इति (जै. I. 3. 16)। अतः कार्यत्वे सति सर्वधर्मत्वम्। विश्वरूप on या. I. 53.

siddhāntasūtra 'api va sarvadharmaḥ syāt tannyāyatvād vidhānasya' (Jai. I. 3. 16) and adds that it must be regarded as 'Sarvadharma' (as applicable to all) if it is recommended as somthing to be observed by some people. There is a difference of opinion between medieval writers on Dharmaśāstra as to the exact import of this adhikaraṇa. The Dāyabhāga says[2093] that the Śruti to be inferred from the practice of Holākā by easterners is simply the general one (sāmānya-śruti) that Holāka rites should be observed. On the other hand Govindānanda in his Com. on the Prāyaścitta-viveka of Śūlapāṇi says that the Holākādhikaraṇa leads to this only that the Śruti to be inferred from this practice is not in the form 'the easterners should perform Holākā' but it is in a general form viz. 'the usage of a country should be observed by those in the country'.

2093. तस्माद्यस्मादेवाचारात् स्मृतिवाक्याद्वा या श्रुतिरवश्यं कल्पनीया सैव तदुक्तस्याचारांशस्य स्मृतिपदस्य चोपपत्तेर्न तत्राधिककल्पनेति होलाकाधिकरणस्यार्थः । दायभाग II. 42; प्राच्यैर्होलाका कर्तव्येति विशेषश्रुतिर्न कल्प्यते किं तु देशधर्मः कर्तव्य इति सामान्यत एव, अन्यथा देशान्तरे आचारान्तरात् श्रुत्यन्तरकल्पनागौरवं स्यादिति होलाकाधिकरणन्यायः। तत्त्वार्थकौमुदी on प्रायश्चित्तविवेक p. 142 (Jiv. ed.).

CHAPTER XXX

On Mimāṁsā principles and rules of interpretation in relation to Dharmaśastra

The Pūrvamīmāṁsā evolved a method of its own and a set of principles for the interpretation of Vedic texts. It is now time to set down and explain some of these principles and rules and point out how they have been employed by Dharmaśāstra writers for solving their own difficulties.

The Mīmāṁsā principles and rules of interpretation fall into several groups. There are rules that are concerned only with the details of Vedic sacrifices and their inter-relations. The most important rule in this field is this that only *Vidhis* properly so called have absolute authority and binding force, while what are called *arthavādas* have authority in so far only as they form one syntactical whole with the vidhis and as they are meant to praise the vidhis. (P. M. S. I. 2. 7). Vidhis and Arthavādas are not discussed consecutively, but they are scattered over the several chapters of the P. M. S. For example, arthavādas are first dealt with in I. 2. 1–18 (the arthavādādhikaraṇa), but in many other places there is a discussion about arthavādas as in III. 4. 1–9, III. 4. 10, III. 4. 11, IV. 3. 1–3, VI. 7. 26–30, X. 8. 5, X. 8. 7 and 8.

It should not be forgotten that the Mīmāṁsā is not concerned with legislation by the king or a sovereign popular assembly. It promises to convey correct knowledge of Dharma (meaning religious rites and matters connected therewith) and the means of arriving at that knowldge is the Veda itself and the main purpose of the Mīmāṁsā is to regulate the procedure (*itikartavyatā*), the various auxiliary and principal matters in Vedic sacrifices.[2094]

There is a great deal of difference between the interpretation of statutes and the Mīmāṁsā rules of interpretation. In the

---

2094. धर्मे प्रमीयमाणे तु वेदेन करणात्मना। इतिकर्तव्यताभागं मीमांसा पूरयिष्यति॥ q. by युक्तिस्नेहप्रपूरणी on शास्त्रदीपिका (p.36), अधिकरणकौमुदी of देवनाथ p.3, तन्त्ररहस्य. The word itikartavyatā occurs in P. M. S. itself (III. 3. 11 असंयुक्तं प्रकरणादितिकर्तव्यतार्थित्वात्). On the preceding sūtra (भूयस्त्वेनोभयश्रुति) शबर remarks 'ये च भूयांसो गुणाः सेतिकर्तव्यता' and on P. M. S. XI. 2. 8 (अङ्गानि तु विधानत्वात्प्रधानेनोपदिश्येरंस्तस्मात्स्यादेकदेशत्वम्) शबर explains 'विधानं कल्प इतिकर्तव्यतेत्यर्थः'.

first place, statutes are man-made, they express the will of the enacting authority, have mostly secular purposes, may be amended or even repealed and have to be expounded according to the intent of those that made them. But the Mīmāṁsā is concerned with the Veda that is deemed eternal and self-existent (and not man-made), that deals with religious matters, cannot be amended or repealed and is to be expounded according to the intent of the Vedic words. Therefore, though some rules of the interpretation of Vedic texts evolved by the Pūrvamīmāṁsā are identical with or resemble the rules of the interpretation of statutes developed in such works as Maxwell's on 'interpretation of statutes', the author will not enter into any detailed treatment showing the parallelisms between Mīmāṁsā rules and Maxwell's rules. This task was attempted over fifty years ago by Mr. Kishorilal Sarkar in his Tagore Law Lectures published in 1909. It would appear ungracious on the part of the present author to offer criticisms against a predecessor in the same field who wrote more than half a century ago when Mīmāṁsā studies by modern educated Indians were in their infancy. But the author cannot help stating that Mr. Sarkar was obsessed by the notion that he must show somehow or other that Jaimini's rules of interpretation were not inferior to those of Maxwell's and agreed closely with him. For this purpose he relies often on far-fetched analogies and employs obscure explanations. In several cases it appears that he had not been able to grasp correctly what Jaimini and Śabara meant.[2095]

In this work the author is concerned only with the question of the influence on Dharmaśāstra of Pūrvamīmāṁsā doctrines and rules of interpretation. He has already shown how many of the doctrines and technical expressions of the Mīmāṁsā have dominated Dharmaśāstra. He would now turn to the rules of interpretation.

The first rule is that no part of the Veda (not even a word) can be treated as *anarthaka* (meaningless or purposeless). It is therefore that a very large part of the Veda is treated as arthavādas intended to praise vidhis. This has been stated above (p. 1243). The result of the vital importance attached to vidhis

2095. Vide his explanation of the words 'Vedam kṛtvā vedim karoti' in pp. 241–242 of his work and the remarks of the present author in *H.* of Dh. Vol. III, pp. 841–42 and his explanation of 'arthakarma' and 'pratipattikarma' as 'essential act' and 'non-essential act' respectively (pp. 186–187) and the explanations of these given above on pp. 1231–32.

in the PMS and of the assignment of a very subordinate role to *arthavādas* (as merely intended to praise) and to mantras (as merely 'abhidhāyaka') has resulted in this that a small portion of the Brāhmaṇas has been held to be of supreme authority, while a large part of the Brāhmaṇas and of Saṁhitās containing mantras has become of secondary importance or of little importance.

The Mīmāṁsā rules of interpretation fall into different classes from different standpoints. Some rules are general and some are special. Some rules have to do with the proper procedure to be followed when several texts laying down matters relating to the same subject are in conflict by means of the application of the technical words śruti, liṅga, vākya, prakaraṇa, sthāna and samākhyā (III. 3. 14) and there are rules about adhikāra, atideśa, ūha, bādha, tantra and prasaṅga.

Some examples of general rules may first be cited. That *vidhis* alone have special obligatory authority and that arthavādas are authoritative only in so far as they form one syntactical whole with the vidhis is a general rule. The rules distinguishing between *vidhis* (properly so called), *niyama* vidhis and *parisaṅkhyā* are general.

The Mīmāṁsā rule is that where there is a [2096] doubt about the exact meaning of a part of a passage, it may be determined by relying on the remaining parts of the passage. Vide above for the example 'he puts down anointed pebbles' &c. (p. 1240). The Mimāṁsā is very much against assuming conflict among Vedic texts and therefore allows an option only if there is no other way out. Vide remarks on *vikalpa* above (p. 1250). Another general rule is that the singular includes the plural. In the Mimāṁsā it is called 'Grahaikatvanyāya (P. M. S. III. 1. 13-15). In the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice a number of cups (*grahas*) filled with Soma are offered to deities and drunk at the three *savanas* (pressings of Soma) and Śruti states 'he wipes or cleanses the cup with the strainer made of white wool' (daśāpavitreṇa graham sam-mārṣṭi) and in the Darśapūrṇamāsa it is said 'he carries a firebrand round the puroḍāśa (cake)'. The question is

---

2096. सन्दिग्धेषु वाक्यशेषात्। पू. मी. सू. I. 4. 24. The विषयवाक्य is 'अक्ताः शर्करा उपदधाति तेजो वै घृतम्' (तै. ब्रा. III. 2. 5. 12). Compare Maxwell p. 29 'the words of each clause should be so interpreted as to bring them in harmony with other provisions.'

whether a single cup ('graham' is the word used) is to be cleansed or a single puroḍāśa is to have a firebrand carried round it or whether all cups called grahas or puroḍāśas are to be treated as stated. The established conclusion is that all grahas are to be cleansed and all puroḍāśas have the firebrand carried round them. The singular number is not intended to be insisted on.[2097] From this a further general rule is derived by Kumārila and others that an attribute of the subject (*anuvādya* or *uddiśyamāna*)[2098] about which something is predicated (*vidheya*) is not intended and should not be insisted upon. This is frequently relied on in Dharmaśāstra works. Yāj. II. 121 states that the father and son have equal ownership in land, a corrody and wealth (gold and silver &c.) acquired by the grand-father. Here the word *pitāmaha* is not to be insisted upon and the same rule applies to land or wealth acquired by a great-grand-father, as the V. M. says.[2099] Similarly, when Nāradasmṛti says (16. 37) 'of brothers being undivided religious worship (or rites) are one, but if there is a partition then they may have separate religious worship'. Here the proper subject is the word 'undivided persons', and the word 'brothers' is used only as an attribute, which is not intended to be insisted on and the same rule applies to undivided grand-father, father, sons, uncles and nephews. Medhātithi on Manu II. 29 mentions this maxim. The same rule is applied in some cases to gender also i. e. a word importing males includes females also. For example, Yāj. II. 182 and Nārada (8. 40 ff) lay down certain rules about a *dāsa* (male slave). The V. M. says that the masculine gender in these passages is not intended to be insisted upon, but the rules

---

2097. Vide Maxwell (10th ed, of 1953) p. 349 for the propositions that words importing masculine gender include females and that the singular includes the plural and *vice versa*.

2098. The Ṭupṭīkā on III. 4. 22 remarks 'उद्दिश्यमानस्य विशेषणमविवक्षितमिति स्थितमेव' and on X. 3. 39 'उद्दिश्यमानस्य च संख्या न विवक्ष्यते ग्रहस्येव.'

2099. The व्य. म. says 'वस्तुतस्तु पितामहपदमविवक्षितम्। अन्यथा प्रपितामहाद्युपात्ते सहशस्वाम्यस्याभावप्रसक्तेः। अनुवाद्यविशेषणत्वाच्च' p. 90. अनुवाद्य means the same thing as उद्दिश्यमान or उद्देश्य (the subject, of which something is to be predicated). 'अत्र अविभक्तानामित्येवोद्देश्यसमर्पकम्। भ्रातृणामिति तु तद्विशेषणत्वादविवक्षितम्' व्य. म. p. 132. मेधातिथि on मनु II. 29 says 'न च प्रधाने लिङ्गसंख्यादि विशेषणं विवक्ष्यते ग्रहं संमार्ष्टीति सत्यप्येकवचने सर्वे ग्रहाः संमृज्यन्ते।'. श्लोकवा. defines उद्देश्य as 'यदुत्कर्षः प्राधान्यमित्याद्युद्देश्यलक्षणम्। तद्गुणत्वमेवकारश्च स्यादुपादेयलक्षणम्॥ यद्यर्थे स्वशक्त्या च शब्दो वक्त्रनपेक्षया॥ अनुमानपरि॰ verses 109–110).

apply even to female slaves.[2100] There are exceptions to these rules. The rule about *grahas* does not apply to *camasas* (P. M. S. III, 1. 16–17).[2101] This rule that the qualification (viśeṣaṇa) of the subject in a vidhi is not meant to be taken literally and emphasized is applied in many other cases. Three verses from the Kālikāpurāṇa are quoted by Kalpataru (on vyavahāra pp. 210-211) and V. M. (pp. 45–46) about the performance of an ordeal in certain grave charges and this maxim is applied by the V. M. there in the words 'paradārarūpam viśeṣaṇam-avivakṣitam-abhiśāpasyānuvādyatvāt'; vide notes to V. M. pp. 83–84. But in 'paśum-ālabheta', where there is a vidhi about 'yāga' it must be held that what is laid down is yāga as qualified by being made with a male animal and therefore only one paśu (and that paśu a male) is to be sacrificed.

Although the Veda employs the masculine gender (in svargakāmo yajeta, 'one desiring heaven should offer a sacrifice'), yet Jaimini establishes (in VI. 1. 6–16) that even women are included and have a right to offer a yāga.[2102] Jaimini further provides that husband and wife should perform a religious right in co-operation (VI. 1. 17–21), but he provides that where the Śruti specifically provides for certain matters to be done by the *yajamāna*[2103] (the male performer) it is the male alone who can perform them as the wife is not equal to the husband in the knowledge of mantras and is ignorant and therefore she is restricted to the performance of those acts that are expressly enjoined for her such as looking at the clarified butter, observing *brahmacarya* and the like (VI. 1. 24 'tasyā yāvad-uktam-āśīrbrahmacaryam-atulyatvāt'.) The wife also performs bath and such

---

2100. अस्मिन् प्रकरणे दासपदगतपुंस्त्वस्याविवक्षितत्वाद् दास्यामप्येष सर्वो विधिर्ज्ञेयः। व्य. म. p. 210. Vide also व्यवहारप्रकाश (part of वीरमित्रोदय) p. 322. As to 'पशुमालभेत' शबर remarks on VI. 1. 9: 'इदं तु पशुत्वं यागस्य विशेषणत्वेन श्रूयते। तत्र पशुत्वस्य यागस्य च सम्बन्धो न द्रव्ययागयोः। यथा पशुत्वं यागसम्बद्धमेवं पुंस्त्वमेकत्वं च। सोयमनेकविशेषणविशिष्टो यागः श्रूयते। स यथाश्रुत्येव कर्तव्यः। उपादेयत्वेन चोदितत्वात्।' p. 1359.

2101. These two rules that the singular includes the plural and words importing the masculine gender shall be taken to include females are the same in section 13 of the Indian General Clauses Act X of 1897, subject to this that if there is anything repugnant in the subject or context the rule will not apply.

2102. तस्मात्फलार्थिनी सती स्मृतिमप्रमाणीकृत्य द्रव्यं परिगृह्णीयाद्यजेत चेति। शबर on पू. मी. सू. (VI. 1. 13).

2103. तस्मात्सर्वं यजमानेन कर्तव्यम्। आम्नातं विहितं पत्न्या च। टुप्टीका on VI. 1. 24 p. 1376.

acts as applying collyrium, sipping water (*ācamana*), observes silence till the morning or evening *agnihotra* is gone through. She has her waist girt up with a yoktra (a triple cord of *muñja* grass) in Darśapūrṇamāsa and other sacrifices. She has also to look upon the clarified butter in the pot with a mantra (Tai. S. II. 10. 3 'mahīnām payosyoṣadhīnām rasossi adabdhena tvā cakuṣā vekṣe suprajāstvāya' ('thou art the milk of cows, the fluid of herbs, with an invincible eye I look on thee for securing good progeny'). The wife was to learn the mantras she had to repeat in sacrifices from her father or husband before the husband set up the sacred fires (vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. p. 1041 n). Gradually, the wife lost all importance in Vedic sacrifices and came to be a mere silent spectator[2104] of all the weary details that had to be gone through by the sacrificer and the priest.

In spite of the above restrictions on the wife's powers about Vedic sacrifices many smṛti rules apply to women also, though the text employs the masculine gender. For example, Manu XI. 93 provides that a brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya and vaiśya should not drink *surā*. This prohibition applies to wives of the members of the three varṇas according to the Mit. on Yāj. III. 256.

The P. M. S. holds that the gender and number of a word in a *vidhivākya* may in certain cases be intended and insisted on. For example, in PMS IV. I. 11–16 it is established that the Agnīṣomīya animal to be sacrificed in Jyotiṣṭoma as prescribed in the words 'yo dīkṣito yad agnīṣomīyam paśum-ālabhati' (that the person who has undergone dīkṣā and offers the animal to Agni and Soma) is only one and that the words in the Aśvamedha 'he offers kapiñjalas to the season of[2105] spring', the

2104. The Paddhati in the Com. on कात्या. श्रौ. IV. 13 remarks 'उपवेशनव्यतिरिक्तं पत्नी किमपि न करोतीति संप्रदायः। तच्च साधुतरम्'। विद्वत्तया पुमानेव कुर्यात् विदुषीतरा। वेदाध्ययनशून्यत्वात्। प्रतिषिद्धं हि तत्स्त्रियः॥' शास्त्रदीपिका on VI. 1. 24.

2105. वसन्ताय कपिञ्जलानालभते ग्रीष्माय कलविङ्कान् &c.; this occurs in वाज. सं. 24. 20 and मैत्रा. सं. III. 14. 1. This is कपिञ्जलन्याय embodied in पू. मी. सू. XI. 1. 31–46. The plural Kapiñjalān is satisfied by offering three as the lowest number. To offer a thousand would not yield more abundant reward, since only a single provision is made and not several alternate numbers. The शास्त्रदीपिका remarks 'यो हि त्रीनालभते यश्च सहस्रं तयोरुभयोरपि बहुत्वसम्पादनमविशिष्टम्।... निवृत्तव्यापारे च विधौ, न हिंस्यादिति निषेधशास्त्रं प्रवर्तत इत्यधिकानालम्भः।'. It is referred to in परा. मा. I. 2. 281 'प्राणायामैरिति बहुवचनस्य कपिञ्जलन्यायेन त्रित्वे पर्यवसानात् त्रिभिः प्राणायामैः शुध्यति इत्यर्थः।'. Compare also P.M.S. IV. 1. 11 ff.; 'तथा च लिङ्गम्' पू. मी. सू. IV. 1. 17. The passage is तै. सं. II. 1. 2. 5 'वसन्ते प्रातराग्नेयीं कृष्णग्रीवीमालभेत ग्रीष्मे मध्यन्दिने संहितामैन्द्रीं शरद्यपराह्णे श्वेतां बार्हस्पत्याम्' and then in तै. सं. II. 1. 2.6 'गर्भिणयो भवन्ति, इन्द्रियं वै गर्भ इन्द्रियमेवास्मिन् दधति.'

kapiñjala birds to be offered are only three (and not one nor two nor more than three). Similarly, the gender in the passage 'he sacrifices in the morning in spring an animal with dark coloured neck to Agni, in summer in the noon an animal of different colours, in the autumn in the afternoon a white animal to Bṛhaspati', it is a female animal that is offered because immediately thereafter the words 'they become pregnant' occur. Dharmaśāstra works often say that the masculine gender used in many texts excludes women. For example, the Agnipurāṇa [2106] (175. 59–61), when dealing with the rules to be observed in all *vratas* in general, provides that the person undergoing vrata should take a bath, should worship the golden images of the deities of the *vratas*, perform *japa* and *homa* and at the end of the *vrata* make gifts according to his ability and should feed 24, 12, 5 or only three *vipras*. The N. S. quotes this from Pṛthvīcandra and observes that as the masculine gender 'viprāḥ' is employed only males of the brāhmaṇa class are to be fed and not women.

As against this, when Hemādri [2107] quoting Padma says 'If a woman is pregnant, freshly delivered, or is ill and becomes impure, she should get her *vrata* performed through another and when she becomes pure she may observe it personally,' the N. S. remarks that this applies to men also when they are impure, since the gender here is not intended to be emphasized.

There are Mīmāṁsā rules about the interpretation of words and also about sentences. First a few of the rules about words may be illustrated. (1) Śabara in the very first sentence of his bhāṣya propounds the principle that as far as possible the words in the sūtras of Jaimini and in the Veda are to be understood in the sense in which they are understood in popular usage and not in a secondary or technical sense. The same rule is propounded by Jaimini in III. 2.1–2 in connection with the meaning of 'barhis' in the mantra 'I cut the *barhis* as an abode for gods'. Here the conclusion is that *barhis* is to be taken in the primary sense of 'handful of kuśa grass' and not in a secondary sense

---

2106. पृथ्वीचन्द्रोदयेऽग्निपुराणे–स्नात्वा व्रतवता सर्वव्रतेषु व्रतमूर्तयः। पूज्याः सुवर्णमय्याद्याः ... व्रतान्ते दानमेव च। चतुर्विंश ... पञ्च वा त्रय एव च। विप्रा भोज्या यथाशक्ति तेभ्यो दद्याच्च दक्षिणाम्॥ अत्र विप्रा इति पुल्लिङ्गनिर्देशात् पुमांस एव भोज्याः, न तु स्त्रियः। एवं सहस्रभोजनादावपि। विरूपशेषस्य प्रमाणान्तरं विनाऽयुक्तत्वात्। नि. सि. p. 24. It also relies on what Śabara says on III. 3. 17 and 19.

2107. तथा हेमाद्रौ पाद्मे। गर्भिणी सूतिकादिश्च कुमारी वाथ रोगिणी। यदाऽशुद्धा तदान्येन कारयेत् प्रयता स्वयम्॥ इति पुंसोप्येष विधिः, लिङ्गस्याविवक्षितत्वात्। नि. सि. p. 28.

such as kāśa or other kind of grass. Śabara winds up with the[2108] words 'between the primary and secondary senses of a word it is proper to hold that the primary sense is to be taken for the business in hand'. Again, on I. 3. 30 Śabara says[2109] that the words are the same as in the Veda and popular use and the meanings are the same.

As regards the setting up of Vedic fires, the Tai. Br. I. 1. 4 and Āp. Śr. V. 3. 18 prescribe different seasons for men of the three *varṇas* and add that a 'rathakāra should set up Vedic fires in the rainy season'. The question arises whether the word 'rathakāra' in these passages means a person of that caste (i. e. whether it is to be taken in the popular sense) or whether it refers to any one of any *varṇa* who manufactures chariots (i. e. the etymological sense). The established conclusion is that the popular sense is to be taken and not the etymological (P. M. S. VI. 1. 44–50). In the case of the *rathakāra* the mantra for *ādhāna* (setting up of Vedic fires) is 'ṛbhūṇām tvā' (Tai. Br. I. 1. 4. 8). Though not belonging to one of the three higher varṇas, the rathakāra could repeat that mantra because the Śruti expressly authorized him to do so, but he was not entitled to *upanayana*. The P. M. S. (VI. 1. 50) held that the *rathakāra* (mentioned in the Tai. Br. and Āp. Śr.) was a caste called Saudhanvana which is neither śūdra nor one of the three higher varṇas but is slightly inferior to them. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 45–46. The S. Kau. argues that[2110] if once the right of a Hindu

---

2108. तस्मान्मुख्यगौणयोर्मुख्ये कार्यसंप्रत्ययः। शबर on III. 1. 1. The same words occur in the महाभाष्य on वार्तिक 4 on पा. VI. 3. 46 as गौणमुख्ययोर्मुख्ये कार्यसंप्रत्ययः; तस्माल्लोकवेदयोरभिन्नाः शब्दार्था इति। तन्त्रवा. on same सूत्र p. 293. शङ्कराचार्य on V. S. IV. 3. 12 employs the same words as the first quotation from Śabara. Vide शास्त्रदी. on III. 2.1–3. In *Umaid Bahadur* V *Udaichand* I. L. R. 6 Cal. 119 (F. B.) at p. 126 (where the question was whether the word 'sapiṇḍa' defined by the Mitākṣarā in the *ācāra* section as a person connected by particles of one body can be taken for purposes of inheritance as persons connected by the offering of funeral oblations) it is stated 'it is a well understood rule of construction among the authors of the Institutes of Hindu Law that the same word must be taken to have been used in one and the same sense throughout a work, unless the contrary is expressly indicated.' Vide *Ramchandra* V *Vinayak* L. R. 41. I. A. 290 where the above passage in the Calcutta case is quoted with approval at pp. 303–304.

2109. य एव लौकिकाः शब्दास्त एव वैदिकास्त एवैषामर्था इति। शबर on I. 3. 30.

2110. न च प्रतिग्रहमन्त्राभावेनाधिकाराभावोक्तिरपि घटते। अनुज्ञायां सत्यामिवासत्यामपि तस्याहुकरीत्याधिकारनिर्णये रथकारस्य मन्त्राध्ययनकल्पनासम्भवात्। एतेनाशूद्रस्य सत्यामन्त्रकः प्रतिग्रह इति निरस्तम्। सं. कौ. p. 168.

widow to adopt is conceded, the mere fact that she is not entitled to repeat Vedic mantras in general cannot deprive her of that right and that it is possible to hold, as in the case of the rathakāra, that she can repeat the specific mantra required in adopting a boy. The Tai. S. IV. 5. 4. 2 separately mentions several craftsmen such as *takṣan*, rathakāra, kulāla, karmāra &c. From Atharvaveda III. 5. 6 and Vāj. S. 30. 6 (medhāyai rathakāram dhairyāya takṣāṇam) it appears that the rathakāra held a good position in the then society.

A word is to be understood in that shade of its meaning that is appropriate to the act in hand. For example, śruti says 'he cuts off with sruva, he cuts off with a knife, he cuts off with the hand' (the same verb 'avadyati' being used for all the acts). The question is whether one is to cut all offerings, whether liquid or solid, whether of flesh or other substances, with sruva ladle or whether he is to employ the method or implement appropriate for each i. e. clarified butter should be taken from a pot and offered by means of a sruva ladle, flesh should be cut off with a knife and offered, and hard or thick things (like fuel sticks) should be offered with the hand. The conclusion is that one is to offer in the way most appropriate to each kind of offering. This is called 'sāmarthyādhikaraṇa' (PMS.[2111] I. 4. 25). The V. M. relies on this when dealing with the homa prescribed by Pitāmāha for all ordeals in the words 'homa should be offered in the four directions with clarified butter, boiled rice and fuel sticks &c' and declares that the homa of clarified butter should be made with sruva ladle, of havis (i. e. 'boiled rice &c') with *sruc* and of fuel sticks with the (right) hand, on account of the fitness (sāmarthya) of these for the various offerings and sharply criticizes Raghunandana who in his Dāyatattva provided that the homa should be made of all three together (and not separately). A similar rule is applied to the ten sacrificial implements

2111. अर्थाद्वा कल्पनैकदेशत्वात्। पू. मी. सू. I. 4. 25; शबर quotes 'स्रुवेणावद्यति, स्वधितिनावद्यति हस्तेनावद्यति, इति श्रूयते। किं स्रुवेणावदातव्यं सर्वस्य द्रवस्य संहतस्य मांसस्य च। तथा स्वधितिना हस्तेन च उत सर्वेषामर्थतो व्यवस्था'. The पूर्वपक्ष is अविशेषाभिधानादव्यवस्थेति. The conclusion is अर्थाद्वा कल्पना, सामर्थ्यात्कल्पनेति स्रुवेणावद्येद्यथा शक्नुयात् तथा यस्य शक्नुयात् तस्य चेति। आख्यातशब्दानामर्थं ब्रुवतां शक्तिः सहकारिणी। एवं चेद्यथाशक्ति व्यवस्था भवितुमर्हति। तथा अञ्जलिना सक्तून् प्रदाव्ये जुहोति इति।. This last is a quotation from Tait. S. III. 3. 8. Vide व्य. म. p. 54 for the text and notes pp. 89–93 for detailed explanations of the passage by the present author. The शास्त्रदीपिका on the above remarks 'तस्माच्छक्तिसहायो विधिरेव यथासामर्थ्यं विधेयं व्यवस्थापयति.'

enumerated in Tai. S. I. 6. 8. 2 viz. *sphya* (the wooden sword), the potsherds &c. Here the Pūrvapakṣa is that one may employ any one of these for any purpose required in the sacrifice; the established conclusion (PMS III. 1 11. and IV. 1. 7–10) is that the enumeration of ten implements is a mere *anuvāda* and is not to be understood as the pūrvapakṣa states, but each is to be employed for the purpose for which the Vedic texts prescribe it (such as one cooks the puroḍāśa on potsherds, pounds grains in mortar and pestle). Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 985 n. 2233 for ten implements of sacrifice and others that are required and p. 1232 above for their disposal.

One and the same word must not be used in two senses in the same sentence, that is, in the primary sense and also in the figurative sense.[2112] This maxim is relied upon by the Dāyabhāga. When brothers (sons of the same mother) come to a partition, smṛti texts (like Yāj. II. 123) prescribe that the mother takes a share equal to that of a son. On this the Dāyabhāga remarks that the word 'mātā' (in Yāj. II. 123 and others) primarily means a real mother (*jananī*, that gives birth) and this smṛti rule has no application to the step-mother, since it is improper to hold that the same word once used in a sentence has a primary and a secondary sense at the same[2113] time. But it must be pointed out that all Dharmaśāstra works do not observe this rule. Aparārka (p. 730) on Yāj. II. 123 (pitur-ūrdhvam vibhajatām mātāpyaṁśam samam haret) includes the step-mother under the word 'mātā' following a text of Vyāsa. The Mitākṣarā interpreting Yāj. II. 135 about obstructible heritage stating the order of succession as wife, daughters, parents, brothers, their sons, provides that full brothers first succeed, in default of them half brothers, in default of the last, full brothers'

2112. अन्यायश्चानेकार्थत्वम् । शबर on III. 2. 1 and VII. 3. 3; न ह्येकस्य शब्दस्यानेकार्थता सत्यां गतौ न्याय्या । शबर on VIII. 3. 22. Vide शबर on IX. 4. 18 also. शङ्कराचार्य in his bhāṣya on Brahmasūtra II. 4. 3 puts this rule very clearly 'न ह्येकस्मिन्प्रकरणे एकस्मिंश्च वाक्ये एकः शब्दः सकृदुच्चरितो बहुभिः सम्बध्यमानः कश्चिन्मुख्यः कश्चिद् गौण इत्यध्यवसातुं शक्यम्। वैरूप्यप्रसङ्गात्।'.

2113. पितरि चोपरते सोदरभ्रातृभिर्विभागे क्रियमाणे मात्रेऽपि पुत्रसमांशो दातव्यः समांशहारिणी मातेति वचनात् । मातृपदस्य जननीपरत्वाच्च सपत्नीमातृपरत्वमपि सकृच्छ्रुतस्य मुख्यगौणत्वानुपपत्तेः । दायभाग III. 29–30, p. 67; मातृग्रहणं तत्सपत्न्यादिप्रदर्शनार्थम् । अपरार्क p. 730. It may be noted that in *Vithal* V. *Prahlad* (I. L. R. 39 Bom. 373) a paternal step-grandmother was held entitled to a share when a partition took place between the sons of a deceased son of her co-wife.

sons. The V. M. disagrees[2114] with this and says that the word 'brother' primarily means 'full brother' and only secondarily 'half-brother', that, as it is not allowable to use a word like brother in two senses in the same passage, in default of full brother his son succeeds (and not half-brother as the Mit. provides). The primary sense of a word is got by 'abhidhā', the secondary sense by 'lakṣaṇā'[2115] and sometimes a third sense called suggested sense is said to be due to vyañjanā. These are the three *vṛttis* (functions) of a word.

One of the rules about the interpretations of words is contained in P.M.S.I. 3. 8–9. Śabara cites three instances of words[2116] viz. caru made from yavas, sandals made of boar skin, a cane mat. The words *yava*, *varāha* and *vetasa* are respectively employed by some people in the sense of 'priyaṅgu' (long pepper), dark bird (crow) and jambu (black berry). The prima facie view insists that one may use those words in any one of the two senses. The Siddhānta is that those words must be used in the sense in which the Veda (or śāstra) or śiṣṭas employ them i. e. the usage of learned Aryan people is to be followed where words

---

2114. मातुरभावे भ्राता सोदरः, तदभावे तत्पुत्रः। यत्तु विज्ञानेश्वरादयः सोदराभावे भिन्नोदरस्तदभावे सोदरसुता इत्याहुस्तन्न, भ्रातृपदस्य सोदरे शक्त्या भिन्नोदरे च गौण्या वृत्तिद्वयविरोधात्। व्य. म. p 142.

2115. According to तन्त्रवा॰ there is a slight difference between लक्षणा and गौणी. Vide अभिधेयाविनाभूते प्रतीतिर्लक्षणेष्यते। लक्ष्यमाणगुणैर्योगाद्वृत्तेरिष्टा तु गौणता॥ वह्नित्वलक्षितादर्थाद्यत्पैङ्गल्यादि गम्यते। तेन माणवके बुद्धिः सादृश्यादुपजायते॥ p. 354 on I. 4. 12. गङ्गायां घोषः is लक्षणा (गङ्गातीरे घोषः), while अग्निर्माणवकः (the boy is fire) is an example of गौणीवृत्ति (possession of a quality common to both). गौणी is a variety of लक्षणा which latter occurs in a far larger number of cases. The boy has some of the qualities (गुण) of fire such as very brown colour and the like and therefore here the word 'fire' is applied to the boy in a figurative sense.

2116. तेष्वदर्शनाद्विरोधस्य समा विप्रतिपत्तिः स्यात्। पू. मी. सू. I. 3. 8; यवमयश्चरुः, वाराही उपानहौ, वैतसे कटे प्राजापत्यान् सञ्चिनोति इति यववराहवेतसशब्दान् समामनन्ति। तत्र केचिद्दीर्घशूकेषु यवशब्दं प्रयुञ्जते केचित्प्रियङ्गुषु। वराहशब्दं केचित्सूकरे केचित्कृष्णशकुनौ। वेतसशब्दं केचिद्वञ्जुलके केचिज्जम्ब्वाम्। शबर. The सिद्धान्तसूत्र is शास्त्रस्था वा तन्निमित्तत्वात्। पू. मी. सू. I. 3. 9; शबर explains यः शास्त्रस्थानां स शब्दार्थः। के शास्त्रस्थाः, शिष्टाः तेषामविच्छिन्ना स्मृतिः शब्देषु वेदेषु च। भामती on वे. सू. III. 3. 52 relies on this for holding that the meaning assigned to a word among Aryas in India prevails over the meaning of the word among Āndhras (e. g. of the word राजन्). As regards पीलु, Gaut. (I. 22) prescribes that a kṣatriya or vaiśya brahmacārin should carry a staff of the aśvattha or pīlu tree (आश्वत्थपैलवौ शेषे), while Manu II. 45 prescribes a staff of pīlu or udumbara tree for a vaiśya brahmacārin. The Amarakośa states that pīlu means a tree as well as an elephant.

may have two or more senses. As in several other cases Kumārila does not like Śabara's explanation and proposes two other explanations, viz. one being that the sūtras relate to the word 'pīlu' used in the sense of a tree and *mlecchas* employ it in the sense of elephant. The meaning of the word in smṛtis is a tree and that should be followed. Here 'Śāstrasthāḥ' means 'the sense given to the word in the Śāstra i. e. smṛti'. Another meaning he sees into those sūtras is the comparative strength of smṛti and *ācāra*. This *adhikaraṇa* is relied upon by Viśvarūpa on Yāj. (I. 225) on the question of the primary meaning of the word Śrāddha which he states is 'piṇḍadāna' (offering balls of boiled rice to the *manes*) and not feeding brāhmaṇas. The Parāśara-mādhavīya refers to Parāśara-smṛti (VI. 70-71) about the food cooked from rice in such quantities as measuring an *āḍhaka*[2117] or *droṇa* and rendered unclean by being pecked by crows or touched by dogs and smelt by asses and provides that the measures *āḍhaka* and *droṇa* were to be taken as those known from śāstras and not those known among mlecchas.

Another rule (PMS I. 3. 10) about words is that[2118] words, though of foreign origin, that are in vogue in Sanskrit, are to be understood in the sense which they have in the foreign language and one should not think of an attempt to derive them with the help of Nirukta and grammar. Śabara cites four such words viz. pika (cuckoo), nema (half), tāmarasa (lotus), sata (circular wooden vessel).

Another rule about words is that where a single substance connected with several attributes is concerned in an action laid down for being carried out, all of these attributes should be taken to refer to the same one substance (PMS III. 1. 12). The Tai. S. prescribes 'he purchases Soma with a heifer one year old and having brown eyes and reddish in colour'. Here the two words 'piṅgākṣī' and 'ekahāyanī' yield a good etymological meaning, are in the same case and so refer to the same substance

2117. For āḍhaka, droṇa and other measures of corn, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 881 n. 2053, vol. III. p. 124 n. 165.

2118. चोदितं तु प्रतीयेताविरोधात्प्रमाणेन। पू. मी. सू. I. 3. 10; न ह्यामीषां (पिकादिपदानां) आर्यैरर्थः कश्चिदस्ति। ... तस्मान्म्लेच्छप्रसिद्ध एवार्थोऽमीषां नित्योऽध्यवसीयते। शास्त्रदीपिका on I. 3. 10. The मयूखमालिका gives सूत्रार्थ as म्लेच्छैश्चोदितमपि प्रतीयेत। ग्राह्यं स्यादिति यावत्। प्रमाणेनार्यव्यवहारेणाविरोधात्।. The underlined words occur in the sūtra.

(heifer in this[2119] case). But the word 'aruṇayā' (of red colour) causes a doubt viz. whether it should be separated from the other two words in the sentence and taken in the sense of 'any reddish substance such as a piece of cloth' or whether it should be connected with the verb (he purchases), should thus be subordinate to the purchase and should be taken as referring to the one year old heifer. This last is the established conclusion. How Soma is to be purchased does not follow from any other text. Therefore, in such a case several subsidiaries can be laid down in one injunction. If 'aruṇayā' be taken as referring to any red substance such as a piece of red cloth this one sentence would have to be divided into two vidhis 'he should purchase with a red piece of cloth' and 'he should purchase with a brown-eyed (heifer) one year old'. This would be a fault called 'vākyabheda'. This nyāya is explained by the Madanapārijāta pp. 88–89 and Aparārka (p. 1030) makes use of[2120] it in explaining the correct import of the words of the Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 21 'tam-etam vedānuvacanena brāhmaṇā vividiṣanti' by saying that when the highest object in view is one but the subordinate elements are different these latter are to be lumped together.

Another rule about words is evolved by what is called 'niṣādasthapatinyāya' (PMS VI. I. 51–52).[2121] It is stated that the *Iṣṭi* in which an offering of boiled rice is made to Rudra is

---

2119. अर्थैकत्वे द्रव्यगुणयोरैककर्म्यान्नियमः स्यात्। पू. मी. सू. III. 1. 12; ज्योतिष्टोमे क्रयं प्रकृत्य श्रूयते। अरुणया पिङ्गाक्ष्यैकहायन्या सोमं क्रीणाति। इति। तत्र सन्देहः। किमरुणिमा कृत्स्ने प्रकरणे निविशेतोत क्रये एवैकहायन्यामिति। शबर. The sentence अरुणया ... क्रीणाति is तै. सं. VI. 1. 1. 6–7. शबर has a very lengthy discussion on this. The तन्त्रवार्तिक on पू. मी. सू. II. 2. 6 states 'मासे कर्माणि नानेको विधातुं शक्यते गुणः। अमासे तु विधीयन्ते बहवोप्येकयत्नतः॥' p. 485 quoted in मी. न्या. प्र. p. 39 (Abhyankar's ed.). For example, श्राद्ध is laid down as a विधि but if one wants to lay down some matters about श्राद्ध separate विधिs would be required for each matter, such as गयायां श्राद्धं दद्यात्, कुतपे श्राद्धं दद्यात्. But where there is already no vidhi laying down a guṇa (subsidiary matter) there can be one main vidhi embodying several guṇas, as laid down in P.M.S. I. 4. 9.

2120. किं च परमकार्याभेदेऽवान्तरव्यापारभेदे तु कारकं कारकान्तरेण सङ्गृह्यते यथा—अरुणया ... क्रीणाति इत्यारुण्यमेकहायन्या। अपरार्क p. 1030 on याज्ञ. III. 205 (न्यायार्जित ... गृहस्थोपि विमुच्यते ॥).

2121. स्थपतिर्निषादः स्याच्छब्दसामर्थ्यात्। पू. मी. सू. VI. 1. 51. ...निषादानां स्थपतिरिति षष्ठीसमासो भविष्यति। ...एवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः स्थपतिर्निषादः स्यात्।... कस्मात् शब्दसामर्थ्यात्। ... समानाधिकरणसमासस्तु बलीयान्। तत्र हि स्वार्थे शब्दौ वृत्तौ भवतः। द्वितीया च विभक्तिस्तन्त्रेणोभाभ्यां सम्बध्यते। शबर; compare मैत्रा. सं. II. 2. 4 for the इष्टि and the words तया निषादस्थपतिं याजयेत्।. अत्र तावन्निषादस्थपतिन्यायेन षष्ठी-

(*Continued on next page*)

one that should be performed for niṣāda-sthapati. A niṣāda is a person born of a brāhmaṇa father and śūdra mother (vide Manu X. 8). He does not belong to one of the three higher varṇas. Sthapati means 'chief or leader'. The question whether the compound word means 'a niṣāda who is a chief (that is a karmadhāraya compound) or whether it means 'the ruler of niṣādas' who may not necessarily be a niṣāda himself but may be a kṣatriya (i. e. whether one should take the word as 'ṣaṣṭhī-tatpuruṣa' as 'niṣādānām sthapatiḥ'). The conclusion is that a karmadhāraya is more powerful than a tatpuruṣa, since in the former both the words may be directly connected with the verb (nisādaścāsau sthapatiśca, tam yājayet). The V. M. makes use of this 'maxim'. The Śaunaka-smṛti authorizes śūdras to adopt a son, yet some writers like Rudradhara, author of Śuddhiviveka, held that adoption required a homa with mantras and as a śūdra could not repeat vedic mantras he could not adopt. To this V. M. replies that his power to adopt a son being established by Śaunaka's smṛti all that is required is that he may get the homa performed through a brāhmaṇa. The Bhāmatī on Śaṅkarā's bhāṣya on V. S. I. 3. 15, where the meaning of the word 'brahmaloka' in Chāndogya-Up. VIII. 3. 2 is in question, says that the nisādasthapatinyāya applies and so 'brahmaloka' means 'brahma as the goal' and not 'the world of brahma.' Manu XI. 54 enumerates five Mahāpātakas (deadly sins), one of which is 'gurvaṅganāgama' (sexual intercourse with gurvaṅganā). Commentators have differed about the meaning of this word, some like Bhavadeva in Prāyaścittaprakaraṇa stating that, following niṣādasthapatinyāya, the word must be dissolved as a Karmadhāraya compound (guruḥ or gurvī cāsau aṅganā ca), the meaning being one's own mother, while many others dissolve it as a tatpuruṣa compound meaning 'guror or gurūṇām aṅganā' (which would then include a step-mother, an elder brother's wife and teacher's wife &c.). Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 23–25 for a discussion of this.

Prabhākara held that no word was significant in isolation, but that words became significant when joined together in a

---

(*Continued from last page*)

समासात्कर्मधारयो बलीयानिति स्थितमेव। भामती on शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. I. 3. 15; प्रायश्चित्ते तु यथा स्थपतीष्टौ मन्त्रादिरहितोऽपि साक्षाच्छ्रुत्या निषादः कर्तृतया गृहीतस्तथा शूद्रः प्रायश्चित्तेषु। अपरार्क on या. III. 262 p. 1090. In the Ait. Br. 37. 7 niṣādas, selagas and evil-doers are spoken of as robbing a rich man and running away with the booty.

sentence. Therefore, he and his followers were called 'anvitābhidhānavādinaḥ' as opposed to Kumārila and his followers who held that words have different senses of their own and then they combine in a sentence and yield a further sense of the sentence. These latter were called 'abhihitānvayavādinaḥ'. Vide notes to Sāhityadarpaṇa (I., II., X) pp. 86–88 for explanations of these two terms by the present writer (ed. of 1956).

Let us now turn to the interpretation of *vākya* (sentence). The Ṛgveda and the Sāmaveda are metrical and therefore there is generally no difficulty in arriving at what constitutes in them one syntactical unit (vākya). But much of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda is in prose. Therefore, PMS (II. 1. 46) defines[2122] what makes one vākya by stating that when a number of words serve a single purpose, but if one or a few of those words are separated from the rest, the latter words are incomplete in effecting a purpose and stand in need of the words separated, then all these words make one vākya. An example is the mantra 'I offer thee, that art dear to Agni, at the command of God Savitṛ with the arms of Aśvins, with the hands of Pūṣan'. This is one sentence, the purpose of which is nirvāpa (offering). For other definitions of *vakya*, vide the author's notes on Sāhityadarpaṇa (II. 1) p. 34. For constituting words into a sentence with an understandable meaning expectancy[2123] (ākāṅkṣā), compatibility (yogyatā) and proximity (sannidhi) are required, particularly the first. For example, Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. I. 4. 3 says that without ākāṅkṣā there is no cognition

2122. अर्थैकत्वादेकं वाक्यं साकाङ्क्षं चेद्विभागे स्यात्। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 46; अत्र प्रश्लिष्टपठितेषु यजुःषु कथमवगम्येत, इयदेकं यजुरिति । यावता पदसमूहेनेज्यते तावान्पदसमूह एकं यजुः। कियता चेज्यते। यावता क्रियाया उपकारः प्रकाश्यते तावत्। वक्तव्याश्च वाक्यमित्युच्यते। तस्मादेकार्थः पदसमूहो वाक्यं यदि च विभज्यमानं साकाङ्क्षं पदं भवति। किमुदाहरणं देवस्य त्वा सवितुः प्रसव इति। शबर. The मन्त्र is देवस्य त्वा सवितुः प्रसवेऽश्विनोर्बाहुभ्यां पूष्णो हस्ताभ्यामग्नये जुष्टं निर्वपामि (तै. सं. I. 1. 4. 2, काठक I. 4) and is one वाक्य from देवस्य to निर्वपामि. Vide also शबर on I. 1. 25 (तद्भूतानां क्रियार्थेन समाम्नायोऽर्थस्य तन्निमित्तत्वात्). The word अर्थ in both sūtras means प्रयोजन. The न्यायसुधा takes the word 'artha' as meaning 'sense' (अभिधेय) in order to give to the sūtra a wider scope while Śabara appears to limit it to yajus texts and holds that अर्थ means प्रयोजन. Vide also यावन्ति पदान्येकं प्रयोजनमभिनिर्वर्तयन्ति तावन्त्येकं वाक्यम्। शबर on पू. मी. सू. II. 2. 27 p. 560. The कात्या. श्रौ. has a similar sūtra 'तेषां वाक्यं निराकाङ्क्षम्' I. 3. 2. The com. explains तेषां as यजुषाम्.

2123. आकाङ्क्षा सन्निधानं च योग्यता चेति च त्रयम्। सम्बन्धकारणत्वेन क्लृप्तं नानन्तरश्रुतिः॥ तन्त्रवा. p 455; वाक्यबोधे समासानामङ्गाङ्गित्वाद्यपेक्षया। वाक्यानामेकवाक्यत्वं पुनः संहत्य जायते॥ तन्त्रवा. p. 366 on I. 4. 24 (सन्दिग्धेषु वाक्यशेषात्). This verse is q. in the साहित्यदर्पण II. 1; न चाकाङ्क्षामन्तरेणैकवाक्यताप्रतिपत्तिरस्ति। शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. I. 4, 3.

that the words form a *vākya*. The word *ekavākyatā* occurs in V. S. III. 4. 24 and conveys that there is a twofold ākāṅkṣā viz. grammatical as well as psychological. It is the listener or reader who has, on hearing or reading a word, a desire to know another idea or word to get a complete sense. When several sentences, each conveying its own sense as far as it goes, are brought together having regard to the fact that one of them may be principal and the others auxiliary, they form one syntactical whole. This shows that sentences are of two kinds, vākyas and mahāvākyas, as the Sāhityadarpaṇa puts it.

It follows from the definition and the bhāṣya thereon that, in order to constitute a vākya, three conditions are necessary viz. (1) there must be a number of words uttered or put down together (padasamūha), (2) the words must have an expectancy for each other (i. e. if a word in the collection is dropped no complete sense can be had), (3) all the words must serve one purpose or convey together one meaning (arthaikatva, acc. to another view). It is not absolutely necessary that the words in order to form a vākya must be in close proximity. Even if some words intervene there may be a sentence, provided there is ākāṅkṣā between the words. Śabara on PMS IV. 3.11 illustrates this well as stated in the note.[2124] In the verse quoted 'paśyasi' is to be connected with 'jaradgavam', though several other words intervene. Though there is proximity (sannidhi) between 'pinakṣi' and 'jaradgavam' they do not form a sentence as there is no capacity as also ākāṅkṣā between the two. The upshot is that sannidhi (proximity) of words is generally required to form a sentence, though not necessarily required in every case.

The different parts of a *mantra* text, meant to serve different purposes, may be regarded as distinct sentences. For example, the mantra in Tai. Br.[2125] (III. 7. 5) 'I make an agreeable

---

2124. व्यवहितमपि पराणुद्य व्यवधायकमानन्तर्येण मनसि विपरिवर्तमानमलमेव भवति विशेषमुपजनयितुम्। यथा। इतः पश्यसि धावन्तं दूरे जातं वनस्पतिम्। त्वां ब्रवीमि विशालाक्षि या पिनक्षि जरद्गवम्॥ इति। अत्र इतः पश्यसीति शब्दो बुद्धौ भवति। सः दूरे जातं वनस्पतिमित्येतैः पदैर्व्यवहितेन जरद्गवमित्यनेन शब्देन व्यवधायकान्यपोह्य सम्बध्यमानः सम्बध्यते। यानि पुनरर्थतो ह्यसमर्थानि तान्यानन्तर्येऽपि सति न परस्परेण सम्बन्धमर्हन्ति यथा, या पिनक्षि जरद्गवमित्येवमादीनि। शबर on पू. मी. सू. IV. 3. 11 p. 1254; भामती on वे. सू. III. 4 21 states नहि समभिव्याहृतैरेवैकवाक्यता भवतीति कश्चिन्नियमहेतुरस्ति। अनुषङ्गातिदेशलब्धैरपि विध्यसमभिव्याहृतैरर्थवादैरेकवाक्यताभ्युपगमात्।'.

2125. स्योनं ते सदनं कृणोमि घृतस्य धारया सुशेवं कल्पयामि। तस्मिन् सीदामृते प्रतितिष्ठ व्रीहीणां मेध सुमनस्यमानः॥ तै. ब्रा. III. 7. 5. शबर says (on पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 46) द्वे तु प्रयोजने क्रियेते सदनकरणं पुरोडाशप्रतिष्ठापनं च। तस्माद् भिन्ने वाक्ये पूर्वं सदनकरणे विनियुज्यते, उत्तरं पुरोडाशप्रतिष्ठापने।.

seat (or abode) for thee (O cake!), I prepare it as a very happy one with a stream of clarified butter; do sit thereon with pleased mind, be established in ambrosia, O sacrificial essence of rice'. These are two sentences, the first part being concerned with making a seat, the latter part being concerned with depositing the *puroḍāśa* on the seat. Similarly, in the passage 'I (cut) thee (O palāśa branch) for food, I (wash or rub) thee for vigour' there are two different sentences, that are independent of each other, as the Śat. Br. employs these with the words 'he cuts the palāśa[2126] branch with the words 'for food (I cut) thee', he washes it with the words 'for vigour thee'. The same rule applies to the ten different clauses 'āyuryajñena kalpatām, prāṇo yajñena kalpatām' in Tai. S. I. 7. 9. 2. They are all different sentences.[2127]

The doctrine of Vākyabheda plays a very important part in Mīmāṁsā as well as in Dharmaśāstra. Vākyabheda literally means 'split of sentences'. When the sentences are equally independent and one sentence does not require or expect words from the other sentence to complete it, they should be treated as separate sentences. This is one sense of 'Vākyabheda.' Another and more frequent sense of Vākyabheda is as follows: The underlying principle of vākyabheda is that one and the same text cannot be construed as laying down two separate *vidhis* (prescriptions) or that when a certain matter has already been prescribed and then several auxiliary matters are to be prescribed, prescribing[2128] all the auxiliaries in one sentence would

---

2126. समेषु वाक्यभेदः स्यात्। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 47; समेषु परस्परानाकाङ्क्षेषु वाक्यं भिद्यते। इषे त्वा इत्यनेनैकोऽर्थः क्रियते, ऊर्जे त्वा इत्यनेनापरः।... श्रुत्या तु गम्यते इषे त्वेति छिनत्ति ऊर्जे त्वेत्यनुमार्ष्टि इति। इषे त्वोर्जे त्वा are the very first words of तै. सं. The शतपथ I. 7. 1. 2 has तमाच्छिनत्ति इषे त्वोर्जे त्वेति. The sūtra may be explained as समेषु परस्परनिरपेक्षतया तुल्येषु यजुर्भेदः स्यात्।.

2127. तत्रैकामायुःक्लृप्तिं 'आयुर्यज्ञेन कल्पताम्' इत्येष मन्त्रः शक्नोति वदितुम्। प्राणो यज्ञेन कल्पताम्–इत्ययमपि प्राणक्लृप्तिमपराम्। एवं तु सर्वे क्लृप्तिविशेषवचनाः। शबर on II. I. 47.

2128. प्राप्ते कर्मण्यनेकगुणविधाने वाक्यभेदापत्तेः। यथाहुः। प्राप्ते कर्मणि० (तन्त्रवा. p. 485 on II. 2.6 quoted in n. 2119). अत्र कर्मपदवत् गुणेत्युपलक्षणम्। एकोद्देशेनानेकविधाने वाक्यभेदात्। मी. न्या. प्र. pp. 36, 39. All this is based on Śabara's words 'कर्मचोदना वा आग्नेयादयः स्युः। कुतः। गुणानां युगपच्छासनात्। एकेनैव वाक्येनात्रानेको गुणो विधातुमिष्यते भवता। न च शब्दान्तरेण चोदिते कर्मण्यनेको गुणः परस्परसम्बन्धेऽप्यसति शक्यते विधातुम्। (on II. 2. 6. pp. 485–486). Vide also शबर on p. 593 on II. 3. 4. The मदनपारिजात (on p. 88) has an elaborate discussion upon the proper tithi and time for upākarma in which it echoes the very words of the तन्त्रवा. quoted at the beginning of this note, when मद. पा. states 'तथा च दुष्परिहरणीयो वाक्यभेदः प्राप्ते कर्मण्यनेकगुणविधानात्'.

give rise to the fault of vākyabheda (syntactical split of sentence). In Tai. S. there is the following passage 'the sacrificial post is to be of *udumbara* tree, the udumbara (tree) is vigour, cattle is vigour; he obtains for him (the sacrificer) by means of vigour ūrj (i. e. by udumbara post) vigour (i. e. cattle) for the attainment of vigour'. This is one syntactical whole (vākya). If it be said that there is a vidhi prescribing the use of udumbara post in a sacrifice and that there is also another vidhi about the fruit viz. securing vigour (i. e. cattle); this would give rise to vākyabheda. Therefore there are no two vidhis in the sentence but only a vidhi and an arthavāda (praise).[2129] Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. III. 3. 57 remarks 'ekaṁ hīdam vākyam Vaiśvānaravidyāviṣayam paurvāparyālocanāt pratīyate ... ekavākyatāvagatau satyām vākyabheda-kalpanasyānyāyyatvāt.' This is said with reference to the first aspect of the idea of Vākyabheda.

The basic idea underlying the latter sense of vākyabheda is this. If an act or a substance or a secondary matter has already been the subject of a vidhi and if concerning the act (or substances &c.) a number of other matters (actions, substances &c.) are enjoined in one sentence, there would be vākyabheda (i. e. there would have to be a separate vidhi for each of the other matters relating to what has already been the subject of a *vidhi*). On the other hand, if an action, substance or a *guṇa* is enjoined for the first time along with several secondary matters in one sentence, there would be no fault of vākyabheda i. e. in a single vākya however long or containing many matters, if there is a single vidhi there is no fault. If, in the passage quoted on p. 1258 above[2130] 'one desiring prosperity should offer in sacrifice a white animal to Vāyu', one were to hold that first there is to be a *vidhi* about prosperity as the fruit or reward, there would be two vidhis and so the fault of vākyabheda, but if one holds that the vidhi is only concerned with offering a white animal and what follows 'vāyurvai kṣepiṣṭhā......bhūtim gamayati' is merely an arthavāda (praise of the preceding vidhi), there is no vākyabheda. The fault of vākya-

---

2129. विधौ च वाक्यभेदः स्यात्। पू. मी. सू. I. 2. 25; औदुम्बरो यूपो भवतीति विधावेतस्मिन्नाश्रीयमाणे ऊर्जोऽवरुध्यै इत्येतस्मिंश्च वाक्यं भिद्येत। इत्यमौदुम्बरो यूपः प्रशस्तः स चोर्जोऽवरुद्ध्या इति। शबर.

2130. भूतिकाम इत्येतदन्तो विध्युद्देशः। तेनैकवाक्यभूतो वायुर्वै क्षेपिष्ठा देवतेत्येवमादि ... वाक्यं हि सम्बन्धस्य विधायकं द्वौ चेत्सम्बन्धौ विदध्यात्, भूतिकाम आलभेत, आलम्भेन चैष गुणो भविष्यतीति। भिद्येत तर्हि एवं सति वाक्यम्। शबर on I. 2. 7 pp. 117 and 119.

bheda arises when more vidhis than one are held to occur in the same vākya.[2131]

A few examples must be cited to illustrate the principle of *vākyabheda*. A simple example is 'graham sammārṣṭi'. If one were to interpret this as meaning 'he is to clean the cup' and also as meaning that only a single cup is to be cleaned there would be vākyabheda. Therefore, it was decided that the singular number in 'graham' is not to be insisted upon and cleaning of all cups was to be resorted to; otherwise there would be two vidhis viz. 'graham sammrjyāt' and 'ekam-eva sammṛjyāt'. Śabara quotes (on PMS I. 3. 3) a *śruti* 'one who has a son and whose hair is dark should consecrate the vedic fires'. *Agnyādhāna* is laid down by śruti texts such as Tai. Br. I. 1. 2. 6, Śat. II. 1. 2. Therefore, the above text only lays down certain subsidiary matters about it. A man may have dark hair but no son or he may have a son when his hair is turning grey. Therefore, if that sentence is meant to prescribe both attributes (having a son and also having dark hair), there would be two distinct vidhis in the same *vākya*, that is, there would be the fault of vākyabheda, which has to be avoided. Therefore, that sentence must be understood as indicating a certain age viz. he must not be a mere boy (at the time of agnyādhāna) but of an age to bear a son, nor very old (when hair turns grey). i. e. he must be neither too young nor too old at the time of agnyādhāna. A lakṣaṇā as regards the words 'jātaputraḥ' and 'kṛṣṇakeśaḥ' is resorted to and lakṣaṇā is only a fault as to a word, while vākyabheda is a fault of a sentence and therefore lakṣaṇā should be preferred to vākyabheda. The V. M. quotes (p. 115) the verse of Manu[2132]

2131. बहवोऽपि ह्यर्था युगपदेकेन सम्बध्यन्ते। न च तावता वाक्यं भिद्यते। अनेकविधितो हि वाक्यभेद उक्तः। तन्त्रवा. p. 551 on II. 2 26.

2132. This text of Manu has been a subject of several conflicting judicial decisions, which are now of no use since there is now a law governing Hindu Adoptions viz. the Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act 78 of 1956, by section 12 proviso b of which the decisions in 40 Bom. 429 and in some later cases have been set aside. Those interested may read the present author's notes in his translation of the V. M. pp. 121-123 and the footnotes and his paper (Brief sketch of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā system' pp. 37-38 (ABORI, vol. VI, pp. 1-40) and also H. of Dh. vol. III, pp. 690-697. In *Dattatreya* V. *Govind* I.L.R 40 Bom. 429 (where a person, in whom property had already become vested as the sole surviving male in the family, was given in adoption into another family) it was held, relying on Manu IX. 142, that on adoption that person lost all rights to the property of the

(*Continued on next page*)

IX. 142 'the son given shall not have (share) the family name (*gotra*) and the wealth (*riktha*) of his natural father; the *piṇḍa* (cake offered to deceased ancestors) follows the family name and the wealth; of him who gives (his son in adoption) the *svadhā* (obsequies) cease (so far as that son is concerned)'. After citing the above smṛti passage 'one having a son' and another text for the position of the sacrificial post (vide PMS III. 7. 13–14) with reference to the altar, the V. M. holds that one should not merely emphasize the words *gotra*, *riktha*, *piṇḍa* and *svadhā* used by Manu and take them literally but should hold that the verse contains a lakṣaṇā (indicated meaning); it indicates the cessation of all those consequences that are due to connection with the piṇḍa in the case of the natural father and Manu says nothing about the property taken by a son before he is given in adoption into another family.

Another illustration of vākyabheda can be cited from the law of re-union. The Mit., Dāyabhāga and Sm. C. (on Vyavahāra p. 302) quote a text[2133] of Bṛhaspati 'that man who being once separated from his father, brother, or paternal uncle again dwells

---

(*Continued from last page*)

natural family that had become vested in him before adoption. That decision holds that Manu laid down two propositions, viz. (1) a man forfeits by adoption into another family the property that once belonged to the family and that became vested in him before adoption, (2) A person given in adoption into another family does not, after the adoption, take any property of the family to which he belonged but whose connection with the family ceased after adoption. These are two distinct propositions and to hold that Manu's text is capable of these two propositions is liable to the fault of Vākyabheda. The V. M. (p. 115) further relies on the construction of another vedic text 'He fixes half of the yūpa inside the vedi and half outside it.' This is interpreted by PMS III. 7. 13–14, Śabara and the Tantravārtika as merely indicating a certain region for the fixing of the yūpa and that the words are not to be taken literally, because in that case there would be Vākyabheda. The दुप्टीका brings out the meaning clearly. 'समस्तस्य यूपस्यान्तर्बहिर्वा माने प्राप्ते–अर्धमन्तर्वेदि–इति नियम्यते। द्वितीयस्यार्धस्य पुनरप्य-नियमप्रसक्तौ – अर्धं बहिर्वेदि – इत्यपि विधातव्यम्। ततश्चानेकार्थत्वाद्वाक्यभेदो भिन्नोत्याख्या-ताद्गुणक्लेशश्च प्रसज्यते। अतश्चैकदेशमवधारणमर्धमन्तर्वेद्येव न त्वर्धमेवान्तर्वेदीति। तथा सति स्वार्धान्तरमनियतत्वात् कदाचिदन्तरपि प्राप्नोतीति न बहिर्भावः सिद्ध्यतीति। ... तस्मादुभाभ्यां विशिष्ट एको देशोऽभिधीयत इत्येवमवाक्यभेदः।'.

2133. विभक्तं धनं पुनर्मिश्रीकृतं संसृष्टं तदस्यास्तीति संसृष्टी। संसृष्टत्वं च न येन केनापि किन्तु पित्रा भ्रात्रा पितृव्येण वा। यथाह बृहस्पतिः। विभक्तो यः पुनः पित्रा भ्रात्रा वैकत्र संस्थितः। पितृव्येणाथ वा प्रीत्या स तत्संसृष्ट उच्यते॥ मिता. on या. II 138; दायभाग chap. 12 quotes बृहस्पति and remarks 'परिगणितव्यतिरिक्तेषु संसर्गकृतो विशेषो नादरणीयः परिगणनानर्थक्यात्'.

through affection with them (or any of them) is said to be re-united with them (or him)'. According to the Mit., a reunion is possible only with father, brother and paternal uncle and with no one else, since no one else is mentioned in the text of Bṛhaspati. The V. M. does not approve of this limitation and says that a re-union is possible with all or any of those that participated in the partition and that the three persons, father, brother and uncle are mentioned only by way of illustration (i. e. there is *lakṣaṇā*). A man may separate not only from the three named persons but also from his paternal grand-father, the grandson of his brother and the son of his paternal uncle and several other persons and therefore the construction of the text of Bṛhaspati by the Mit. is liable to the fault of vākyabheda, since on that interpretation there would be two separate propositions viz. (1) that man is to be called re-united who having become separate again stays together with the one from whom he separated, (2) one can re-unite only with the father, brother, or paternal uncle. Thus there would be two distinct prescriptions in one sentence. Therefore, one should have recourse to *lakṣaṇā* viz. that the three named persons indicate a class of persons from whom one may have separated but with whom he then stayed together. The Vīramitrodaya (on Vyavahāra), V. R. (pp. 605–67), V. C. p. 533 hold the same view as that of the V. M.[2134]

The Smṛticandrikā provides that after the death of a man when the sons divide, the mother is entitled to a share equal to that of each son if the estate to be divided is not very large, but if the estate be very large she is to get as much only as would be necessary for her maintenance (although Yāj. II. 123 and others employ the words '*samam aṁśam*'). The Madanaratna on Vyavahāra criticizes this as a bad provision on the ground that it is vitiated by Vākyabheda, since there would be two different propositions (vidhis) about the meaning to be attached to the

---

2134. अत्र पितृभ्रातृपितृव्यैरेव सह संसृष्टता नान्येन वचनेऽनुपादानादिति मिताक्षराविद्‍ु। विभागकर्तृसामान्याधिकरण्येनैव सेति युक्तम् । पित्रादिपदानि तु विभागकर्तृमात्रोपलक्षकाणि। अर्धमन्तर्वेदि मिनोत्यर्धं बहिर्वेदीतिवत्। अन्यथा वाक्यभेदात्। व्य. म. p. 146. This text (अर्धमन्तर्वेदि etc.) is discussed in P.M.S. III. 7. 13–14 (तथा यूपस्य वेदिः। देशमात्रं वाऽशिष्येणैकवाक्यत्वात्) and the conclusion is that this text is not to be taken literally (since in that case there would be two propositions and the fault of Vākyabheda) but as merely indicating the region where the sacrificial post is to be planted. Vide the author's notes in translation of V. M. p. 191.

words 'samam aṁśam' (equal share) according as the estate to be divided is large or small.[2135]

There is another principle about sentences called 'anuṣaṅga' (elliptical extension) or the extension of a word, phrase or clause from a sentence to another or other sentences, provided all those sentences are of the same type or form. This is one type of *anuṣaṅga.* Another type is where each of two or more sentences appears to be complete by itself, but there are certain words of a subordinate character in the last sentence of a passage which have to be taken up or understood in the preceding sentences. This latter is also called *anukarṣa.* In the three *upasads* of Jyotiṣṭoma, the first[2136] is in honour of Agni in which the mantra is 'yā to Agne ayāśayā tanūr-varṣiṣṭhā gavhareṣṭhogram vaco apāvadhīm tveṣam vaco apāvadhīm svāhā'; the other two Upasads have the two mantras 'yā te Agne rajāśaya' and 'yā te Agne harāśayā' which are incomplete and in need of complementary words to complete the sentences. The conclusion is that the words 'Varṣiṣṭhā ... svāhā' are to be supplied from the first sentence and not other words from the popular language that one may choose. Another passage of the Tai.[2137] S. is 'cit-patistvā punātu, vākpatis-tvā punātu, devas-tvā savitā punatvacchidreṇa pavitreṇa vasoḥ sūryasya raśmibhiḥ'. Here the first two clauses appear to be prima facie complete, but when we look to the last clause where the word 'punātu' is particularised by certain other words, we at once feel that the first two clauses also should be connected with the words 'acchidreṇa... raśmibhiḥ' and that then they would be quite complete.

2135. यत्पुनः स्मृतिचन्द्रिकायां समशब्दस्य सार्थकत्वमुक्तं विभाज्यधनस्य भूयस्त्वे जीवनमात्रोपयोगि-धनग्रहणं स्वल्पत्वे तु समांशहरणमेव, न तु जीवनोपयोगवशादधिकहरण-मित्येवमर्थः समशब्द इति तदसुन्दरम् । कदाचिज्जीवनमात्रोपयोगिधनग्रहणविधानं कदाचित्-समांशग्रहणविधानमिति वाक्यभेदापादकाविधिवैरूप्यप्रसङ्गात् । मदनरत्न on व्यवहार p. 331. Vide स्मृतिच. II. p. 268.

2136. अनुषङ्गो वाक्यसमाप्तिः सर्वेषु तुल्ययोगित्वात् । पू. मी. सू II. 1. 48; या ते अग्ने अयाशया तनूर्वर्षिष्ठा गह्वरेष्ठोग्रं वचोऽपावधीं त्वेषं वचोऽपावधीं स्वाहा, या ते अग्ने रजाशया, या ते अग्ने हराशया इति । अत्र सन्देहः । तनूर्वर्षिष्ठेति किं सर्वेष्वनुषक्तव्यामाहोस्विल्लौकिको वाक्यशेषः कर्तव्य इति ।. For the mantra, vide तै. सं. I. 2. 11. 2 and वाज. सं. V. 8. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1151 n. 2562. The वाज. सं. and शतपथ III. 4. 4. 23–25 read अयःशया, रजःशया and हरिशया.

2137. चित्पतिस्त्वा ... रश्मिभिः । तै. सं. I. 2.1.2; शबर on PMS. II. 1. 48 says अथेह कथं भवितव्यम्, यत्र निराकांक्षाणां संनिधौ परिपूरणसमर्थः श्रूयते । यथा चित्पति ... रश्मिभिरिति । ... एकश्चासौ पुनातुशब्दः पुनः पुनरुच्चारितः । तेनावगच्छामो यत्र पुनातुशब्दः प्रयुक्तस्तत्र तेनैकवाक्यत्वादच्छिद्रेणेत्ययमपि प्रयोक्तव्यः । ... स च पुनातुशब्दोऽच्छिद्रेणेत्यनेन विशिष्टः । तेन पुनातुशब्देन सानुषङ्गेण नियोगतः सर्वे निराकांक्षीकर्तव्याः ।.

The V. M. has a long disquisition on the principle of anuṣaṅga applied by the Mit. and Madanaratna to the succession to the wealth of one who died re-united. Yāj. II. 135–136 lay down the order of succession to the wealth of a person dying sonless. Yāj. II. 137 deals with succession to the property of a forest hermit, an ascetic or a perpetual Vedic student. The Mit. then holds that Yāj. II. 138 'saṁsṛṣṭinastu saṁsṛṣṭī' is to be construed as an exception to Yāj. II. 135–136 and understands that the words 'of one dying without having a son' (grandson or great-grandson) are to be supplied before Yāj. II. 138 from II. 136 (i. e. there is to be anuṣaṅga of the words 'svaryātasyāputrasya'. The V. M. does not approve of this and states that there is no rational ground for applying the principle of anuṣaṅga and therefore the order of succession to the property left by one re-united propounded by V. M. becomes different from that of the Mit. The whole discussion is rather abstruse and lengthy and the present writer feels that the space required for exposition should be saved. Those interested may consult the exhaustive notes (pp. 265–275) in the edition of the Vyavahāramayūkha (Poona, 1926) on the passages of the V. M. beginning with the one in the note below.[2138]

This principle of anuṣaṅga cannot apply where words of a different type intervene between the several sentences. For example, when the animal to be offered is killed a long passage occurs which contains the[2139] words 'sam te prāṇo vāyunā gacchatām, sam yajatrair-aṅgāni, sam yajñapatir-āśiṣā' &c. (may your limbs be joined to the worshipful deities and may the sacrificer be united to blessing &c). Here the first clause is

---

2138. संसृष्टिधनहरणाधिकारिणमाह याज्ञवल्क्यः—संसृष्टिनस्तु संसृष्टी सोदरस्य तु सोदरः। पत्नी दुहितरः (या. 2. 135–136) इत्यादेरपवादोऽयम्। ... यत्तु विज्ञानेश्वरमदना-दयोऽपवादस्योत्सर्गसमानविषयत्वनियमात् पूर्वोक्त-स्वर्यातस्यापुत्रस्येत्येतत्पदानुषङ्गादेतदपि पुत्रपौत्रप्रपौत्रहीनविषयम्; । अतस्तादृशमृतसंसृष्टिधनमसंसृष्टिसंनिहितपत्न्यादिसद्भावेऽप्यन्यः संसृष्ट्येव गृह्णीयादिति। तच्चिन्त्यम्। तेन विनापि गतौ सम्भवन्त्यामनुषङ्गे मानाभावात्। व्य. म. p. 147; vide मदनरत्न (on व्यवहार) p. 372 'न च संसृष्टिनस्तु संसृष्टीति याज्ञवल्क्य-वाक्येऽपुत्रस्येति पदाश्रवणात्संसृष्टिमरणमेव प्रयोजकमिति वाच्यं, स्वर्यातस्य ह्यपुत्रस्येति वाक्योपात्तस्यापुत्रस्येति पदस्य स्वर्यातस्येतिपदवत् संसृष्टिवाक्येऽनुषङ्गात्।'.

2139. व्यवायान्नानुषज्येत। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 49; शबर says सं ते वायुर्वातेन गच्छतां सं यजत्रैरङ्गानि सं यज्ञपतिराशिषा इति। वायुर्वातेन गच्छताम्–इत्येष सं यजत्रैरङ्गानि–इति बहुवचनान्तेन व्यवहितत्वात् सं यज्ञपतिराशिषा इत्यत्र नानुषज्यते। ... तस्माद्बहुवचनान्तस्य परस्य च तद्व्यवेतस्य लौकिको वाक्यशेषः कर्तव्य इति।'. The तै. सं. I. 3.8. 1 reads 'सं ते प्राणो वायुना'. It is probable that Śabara quotes from memory or sets out the mantra from the Mai. Saṁhitā I. 2. 15 which reads सं ते वायुर्वातेन.

separated from the 3rd clause by a clause in which there are two words in the plural while the first and third clauses have two words in the singular; therefore there is no anuṣaṅga of the words of the first clause into the 2nd and one may employ for completing the sense of the 3rd clause some ordinary word from popular language (and not the words from the 1st clause).

Veda enjoins many acts such as performing a *yāga*, casting an oblation into fire, making a gift, milking a cow, melting clarified butter &c, but all are not on the same level. Some are *pradhāna* (primary [2140] or principal), while others are guṇabhūta (subsidiary). The acts denoted by words such as Prayājas by which some substance is not embellished or not made fit or is not produced are primary, while those which produce a substance or make it fit (such as pounding in the case of grains of paddy) are subsidiary. Acts are further classified into various groups such as *nitya*, *naimittika* or *kāmya* or as kratvartha and puruṣārtha. These have already been explained. There are six means [2141] by which is ascertained the difference or non-difference among acts viz. (1) śabdāntara (different words, such as yajati, juhoti, dadāti, i. e. yāga, homa, dāna are different acts); abhyāsa [2142] (repetition) as in 'samidho yajati, tanūnapātam yajati' &c. (Tai. S. II. 6. 1. 1-2), where the word yajati is repeated five times and therefore there are five different acts prescribed; (3) saṅkhyā (number) as in 'he sacrifices seventeen animals to Prajāpati' (Tai. Br. I. 3. 4. 3), which are seventeen distinct acts; (4) *guṇa* (an accessory detail such as the deity

---

2140. तानि द्वैधं गुणप्रधानभूतानि। यैर्द्रव्यं न चिकीर्ष्यते तानि प्रधानभूतानि द्रव्यस्य गुणभूतत्वात्। यैस्तु द्रव्यं चिकीर्ष्यते गुणस्तत्र प्रतीयेत तस्य द्रव्यप्रधानत्वात्। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 6-8.

2141. तदिह षड्विधः कर्मभेदो वक्ष्यते-शब्दान्तरं, अभ्यासः, संख्या, गुणः, प्रक्रिया, नामधेयमिति। ...... तदेतन्नानाकर्मलक्षणमित्यध्यायमाचक्षते ...... । शबर on पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 1 'भावार्थाः कर्मशब्दास्तेभ्यः क्रिया प्रतीयेतैष ह्यर्थो विधीयते।'. These six are mentioned in P. M. S. II. 2. 1., II. 2. 2 (अभ्यास), II. 2. 21 (संख्या), II. 2. 23 (गुण), II. 2. 22 (नामधेय or संज्ञा), प्रकरण (or प्रक्रिया) in II. 3. 24. Śabara mentions the six in one order, while the P. M. S. deals with them in a slightly different order. Parāśara I. 38 says that a man should be intent on six actions, viz. bath, sandhyā etc. and relies on śabdāntara to establish that they are six distinct acts and not one composite act. Vide परा. मा. I. 1. 2.

2142. For the distinction between yāga, homa and dāna, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 714 n. 1703.

or substance in such a passage as 'when curds[2143] are put into heated milk it turns into curdled solid mass *āmikṣā* which is offered to Viśvedevas and the liquid called vājina is to be offered to Vājins, these two being two distinct offerings); (5) prakaraṇa, (context). In the sentence 'one should offer agnihotra' (Tai. S. I. 5. 9. 1) there is a vidhi of the daily performance of Agnihotra. In the Kuṇḍapāyinām-ayana [2144] it is said 'he offers agnihotra for a month'. Since this last occurs in a different context altogether (while the former occurs in the context of Darśapūrṇamāsa), this sentence (from Kuṇḍapāyinām-ayana) deals with a different act from that of the daily Agnihotra. (6) The name (Sañjñā) also differentiates acts, since they occur in utpattivākya (originative injunction) as in the passage quoted in the note below.[2145] This technique about determining what actions are different on account of the several grounds noted above, was employed by Hemādri, the Kālanirṇaya and the Nirṇayasindhu in deciding whether Janmāṣṭamīvrata and Jayantīvrata are really one vrata or separate vratas. Vide pp. 132–133 above.

It has already been stated above (p. 1228) that there are four kinds of vidhis of which viniyogavidhi is one. This last conveys the relation between a religious act as principal (*śeṣin or aṅgin*) and [2146] its auxiliaries (aṅgas). This is the concern of the third chapter of the P. M. S., which first defines 'śeṣa', states why it is called 'śeṣa', how it is employed in religious acts, what are the means of determining the relation of śeṣa to śeṣin and the comparative strength of each of the means.

2143. तप्ते पयसि दध्यानयति सा वैश्वदेव्यामिक्षा वाजिभ्यो वाजिनम्।, शबर on IV. 1. 23 cites this and states 'आमिक्षायां दधिपयसी विद्येते न वाजिने। ... वाजिनेति कतकदुको रसः।'. वैश्वदेवी is a तद्धित meaning विश्वेदेवाः देवता अस्याः, formed acc. to पाणिनि IV. 2. 24 (सास्य देवता); वाजिनामिक्षारूपगुणभेदाद्वाजिनद्रव्यकं कर्मान्तरम् आमिक्षाद्रव्यकं च कर्मान्तरमिति चिन्तितम्। वाजिनं नामामिक्षोत्पत्तिशिष्टमुदकम्। आमिक्षा नाम पयोदधिमिश्रणजनितं दृढाकारं द्रव्यम्। सर्वदर्शनकौमुदी p. 100 (T. S. S.). शङ्कराचार्य mentions this text on वे. सू. III. 3. 1. In तै. ब्रा. I. 6. 2. 5 we have 'वैश्वदेव्यामिक्षा भवति। वैश्वदेव्यो वै प्रजाः। ... वाजिनमानयति।'. आमिक्षा is the प्रयोजक (inducing force or motive) of putting curds into boiled milk and vājina is not the prayojaka, since in producing āmikṣā it appears of itself.

2144. शबर on VII. 3. 1 says कुण्डपायिनामयने श्रूयते मासमग्निहोत्रं जुहोतीति। तत्रैतत्समधिगतं नैयमिकादग्निहोत्रात्कर्मान्तरमेतदिति।.

2145. संज्ञा चोत्पत्तिसंयोगात्। पू. मी. सू. II. 2. 22; शबर 'अथैष ज्योतिरथैष विश्वज्योतिरथैष सर्वज्योतिः। एतेन सहस्रदक्षिणेन यजेत इति श्रूयते।. The conclusion is that all the three are names of three different acts.

2146. अङ्गलक्षणमेवेदमिहोक्तं शेषलक्षणम्। तद्विशेषमपश्यत्वात्तत्राम्यास्तर्गविस्थितेः॥ तन्त्रवा. p. 647 on पू. मी. सू. III. 1. 1.

Some examples of aṅga and aṅgin may have to be given here. In 'vrīhīn prokṣati' (he sprinkles rice grains with water) the sprinkling (prokṣaṇa) is an *aṅga* (stands in a subsidiary relation to) of rice grains as directly shown by the objective case (vrīhīn). The prokṣaṇa (is motivated by) has the purpose of contributing to the transcendental result (the *apūrva*), since what is meant is that if, without the sprinkling of water on the rice grains, a sacrifice (yāga) were performed, apūrva would not be brought about. To take another example,[2147] 'he takes hold of the bridle of the horse with (the mantra beginning with) 'they took hold of the bridle of ṛta (cosmic order)'. Here the direct assertion (śruti) shown by the objective case in 'raśanām' shows that that mantra stands in a subordinate relation to (is an aṅga of) the bridle of the horse, since the utterance of it when taking hold of the bridle of the horse effects a saṁskāra in the bridle and taking hold is also an aṅga of the horse bridle (which is in the objective case), just as prokṣaṇa is an aṅga of rice grains.

It has already been stated that 'śeṣa' means 'what subserves the purpose of another' and it is śeṣa of that other (P. M. S. III. 1. 2 'Śeṣaḥ parārthatvāt') and that, according to Bādari (III. 1. 3) 'to substances, properties (like reddish colour of a cow), saṁskāras[2148] (what makes a person or thing fit for being employed in a yāga or for any other purpose) the word śeṣa is always applied, while, acc. to Jaimini (III. 1. 4–6) religious rites are śeṣa to the result or fruit (expressed or implied), the fruit is śeṣa to the agent of religious acts and an agent is śeṣa to certain acts. The word 'śeṣa' is often employed by Dharmaśāstra works. For example, the Mit. while commenting on Yāj. II. 118–119 states that the first half of verse 118 is śeṣa to all the rest[2149] (i. e. serves the purpose of the remaining verse and a half). The result is (if the Mit. be followed) that if a gift is

---

2147. 'Imām-agṛbhṇan raśanām-ṛtasya-ityaśvābhidhānīm-ādatte':—this occurs in Tai. S. V. 1. 2. 1. The words 'imām-agṛbhṇan raśanām-ṛtasya' constitute a quarter of the mantra in Tai. S. IV. 1. 2. 1.

2148. संस्कारो नाम स भवति यस्मिञ्जाते पदार्थो भवति योग्यः कस्यचिदर्थस्य। तेनापि क्रियायां कर्तव्यायां प्रयोजनमिति सोपि परार्थः। शबर on PMS III. 1. 3; तथा संस्कारोप्यवहन्त्यादिर्यागसाधनपुरोडाशादिनिर्वृत्तये चोदितानां व्रीह्यादीनां स्वरूपेणायोग्यत्वादवहतानां योग्यत्वमापादयत्तत्प्रत्ययैवाङ्गं भवतीति। तन्त्रवा. on the same p. 660.

2149. अत्र च पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन यत्किञ्चित्स्वयमर्जितमिति सर्वशेषः। ... तथा पितृद्रव्याविरोधेनेत्यस्य सर्वशेषत्वादेव पितृद्रव्याविरोधेन प्रतिग्रहलब्धमपि विभजनीयम्। मिता. on या. II. 118–119.

acquired (by a coparcener) from a grateful friend who was placed under an obligation by spending family wealth, if a property is acquired by a gift from a member's father-in-law who was paid from the family property for securing the bride for that member or if the property of the family lost to it was recovered by a member with the help of (other paternal estate), or if a member of the family learnt at the expense of the family and made gains from that learning, then those kinds of property were liable to be partitioned among all members. This view of the Mit. was not shared by several other writers and works such as the Dāyabhāga (VI. 1. 8), and Viśvarūpa. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 579–580 for further remarks.

The P. M. S speaks of six means that are helpful in determinig, as regards *viniyoga-vidhis*, what are principal and what are auxiliary when there is a doubt or when there is a conflict. They are śruti (direct vedic statement or assertion), liṅga (indirect indication), vākya (syntactical connection or relation), prakaraṇa (context), sthāna (place or sequence), samākhyā (sañjñā, name). When several of these come together and refer to the same subject each succeeding one is weaker than each preceding one, since each succeeding one is more remote than each preceding one from the objective (viz. the viniyoga). P. M. S. III. 3. 14 is called 'balābalādhikaraṇa'.[2150]

An example where both śruti and liṅga come in conflict is 'with the Aindrī verse (verse addressed to Indra) he should worship the Gārhapatya fire'. The verse addressed to Indra[2151]

2150. श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यानां समवाये पारदौर्बल्यमर्थविप्रकर्षात्। पू. मी. सू. III. 3. 14 ; समवाय means एकार्थोपनिपात. The तन्त्रवार्तिक states 'समानविषयत्वं हि समवायोऽभिधीयते' and adds 'न ह्येकत्र सम्भवमात्रं समवायः किं तर्हि विषयैकत्वम्' (p. 822) and तस्माद्विरोधविषयमेव समवायग्रहणम् (p. 823); दुर्बलस्य भावः दौर्बल्यम्, परस्य दौर्बल्यं परदौर्बल्यं तदेव पारदौर्बल्यम्।; विप्रकर्ष means विलम्ब; शास्त्रदीपिका on this सूत्र (p. 241) remarks 'इदानीं श्रुत्यादीनामेकविषयसमवायेन विरोधे सति बलाबलं विचार्यते'.

2151. निवेशनः सङ्गमनो वसूनामित्यैन्द्र्या गार्हपत्यमुपतिष्ठते। मैत्रा. सं. III. 2. 4. *This verse occurs in* चयन, *According to some (e. g.* भामती *on* वे. सू. *III. 3. 25)* the Aindrī verse is कदाचनस्तरीरसि नेन्द्र सश्चसि दाशुषे। ऋ. VIII. 51. 7 and वाज. सं. VIII. 2. It is used in अग्निहोत्र (महोपस्थान). The words श्रुति and लिङ्ग, have technical senses in PMS III. 3. 14. Śruti ordinarily means Veda or a vedic text. But here श्रुति and लिङ्ग mean respectively निरपेक्षो रवः श्रुतिः, शब्दसामर्थ्यं लिङ्गम् i. e. a vedic word or a passage that is independent (i.e. does not require any intermediate step to be taken) and liṅga means the suggestive power of words. Both the definitions are given by the अर्थसंग्रह'; 'पत्तावच्छ-

(Continued on next page)

is 'niveśanaḥ saṅgamano vasūnām...Indro na tasthau samare pathīnām' (Tai. S. IV. 2. 5. 4). Here the doubt arises whether one should worship Indra as the word 'Aindryā' indicates or whether one should worship Gārhapatya (as the passage directly asserts) with a verse addressed to Indra, or whether one should worship both or whether one should worship either Indra or Gārhapatya as one likes. The conclusion is that śruti (direct Vedic assertion) is more powerful than liṅga. On hearing the words 'Gārhapatyam upatiṣṭhate' we are directly told by the Veda about the worship of Gārhapatya. The word 'Aindryā' being in the instrumental (as in 'dadhnā juhoti'-he performs homa with curds) merely supplies a detail (guṇa) viz. that the mantra to be repeated is one addressed to Indra and there is no word that directly asserts that Indra is to be worshipped.[2152] Śabara on PMS III. 2. 4 explains that even Gārhapatya has some of the qualities of Indra and so metaphorically he may be called Indra (as a brave man is called a lion), since Gārhapatya is a means of accomplishing yajña like Indra or Gārhapatya may be called Indra from the root 'ind', and may be taken to mean 'a master or lord'.

The six means may each come in conflict with all the means that follow each of them. Therefore, there will be five cases of conflict of śruti with liṅga (which has already been described) or with vākya, or prakaraṇa or sthāna or samākhyā; there will be four cases of conflict between liṅga and vākya or each of the three ones (of the means) that follow vākya in the sūtra, in the same way vākya may be in conflict with prakaraṇa and the other two (in all three cases), prakaraṇa may be in conflict with sthāna or samākhyā (i. e. two cases) and sthāna may be in conflict with samākhyā. So that there are in all fifteen cases of conflict of the six means among themselves. We need not

---

(Continued from last page)

ब्दस्यार्थमभिधातुं सामर्थ्यं तल्लिङ्गम्, यदर्थस्याभिधानं शब्दस्य श्रवणमात्रादेवागम्यते स श्रुत्यावगम्यते। श्रवणं श्रुतिः। शबर on III. 3. 13 p 825; compare पाणिनि 'कर्तुरीप्सिततमं कर्म' (I. 4. 49), 'कर्तृकरणयोस्तृतीया' (II. 3. 18). The word ऐन्द्र्या being in the instrumental conveys the idea of करण, while गार्हपत्यं being in the objective case at once conveys that it is principal in उपस्थान.

2152. गुणाद्वाप्यभिधानं स्यात्सम्बन्धस्याशास्त्रहेतुत्वात्। पू. मी. सू. III. 2. 4; शबर, 'भवति हि गुणादप्यभिधानम्। यथा सिंहो देवदत्तः ... इति। एवमिहाप्यनिन्द्रे गार्हपत्य इन्द्रशब्दो भविष्यति। अस्ति चास्यैन्द्रसादृश्यम्। यथैवेन्द्रो यज्ञसाधनमेवं गार्हपत्योऽपि। अथवेन्दतेरैश्वर्यकर्मण इन्द्रो भवति। भवति च गार्हपत्यस्यापि तस्मिन् कार्ये ईश्वरत्वम्।', vide भामती on वे. सू. III. 3. 25.

take into account the conflict of one of the six means with its predecessors, since to say that liṅga may be in conflict with śruti is the same thing as saying that śruti may be in conflict with liṅga. Very large space would have to be devoted if all these fifteen possible conflicts are to be exemplified from Vedic and Dharmaśāstra texts. Therefore, the author does not essay that task.

Dharmaśāstra works often utilize this adhikaraṇa called *balābala* (PMS III. 3. 14). For example, the Par. M. quotes[2153] a śruti passage that one should perform the daily evening *sandhyā* adoration of Āditya (the sun) with mantras addressed to Varuṇa and remarks that "Vāruṇībhiḥ" (like Aindryā) is only liṅga while, 'Ādityam-upsthāya' is śruti (direct assertion) and therefore the sun is to be worshipped in the evening with mantras addressed to Varuṇa and refers to the example 'aindryā gārhapatyam upatiṣṭhate' for support.

The fourth adhyāya of the PMS deals mainly with the subject of *prayojya* and *prayojaka* and *kratvartha* and *puruṣārtha*. The latter two have been explained and illustrated above (pp. 1232–1235). A few illustrations of the first two may be given. The Prayājas have been declared above to be *kratvartha* (p. 1233). Therefore, kratu (sacrifice) is the *prayojaka* (motivating force) of Prayājas. The reward (*phala*, svarga or the like) is the prayojaka of yāga or a puruṣārtha rite. That is a prayojaka for the sake of which a man is led to perform something by a Vedic exhortatory passage. The sentence is 'one should offer the Darśapūrṇamāsa sacrifice for securing svarga'; therefore the reward (*svarga* and the like) is the prayojaka of Darśapūrṇamāsa-yāga.[2154] The injunction to mix curds with milk makes a person do so for producing āmikṣā and not *vājina*, since this latter arises of it-

---

2153. वारुणीभिस्तथादित्यमुपस्थाय प्रदक्षिणम्। यद्यपि वारुणीभिर्वरुणस्योपस्थानं लिङ्गबलात् प्राप्तं तथापि श्रुतेः प्राबल्यात् तया लिङ्गं बाधित्वा आदित्योपस्थाने एव विनियुज्यते। परा. मा. I. 1 pp. 298–299. पराशर° refers to इमं मे वरुण (ऋ. I. 25. 19–21) as वारुणी verses. In Mahārāṣṭra even in these days the vedic mantras recited in सायंसन्ध्या are यच्चिद्धि ते विशो यथा प्र देव वरुण व्रतम् and the following nine verses (i. e. Ṛg. I. 25 1–10).

2154. Compare Śabara on PMS IV. 1. 1 (athātaḥ kratvarthapuruṣārthayor-jijñāsā) 'यापि प्रयोजकाप्रयोजकफलविध्यर्थवादाङ्गप्रधानचिन्ता सापि क्रत्वर्थपुरुषार्थजिज्ञासैव। कथम्। अङ्गं क्रत्वर्थः प्रधानं पुरुषार्थः। फलविधिः पुरुषार्थः, अर्थवादः क्रत्वर्थः। प्रयोजकः कश्चित्पुरुषार्थोऽप्रयोजकः क्रत्वर्थः। तस्मात्क्रत्वर्थपुरुषार्थयोर्जिज्ञासेति सूचितम्।... क्रतवे यः स क्रत्वर्थः, पुरुषाय यः स पुरुषार्थः।'

self in preparing āmikṣā. Therefore, it is āmikṣā, being the *havis* in the Vaiśvadevayāga that is the prayojaka of the Vaiśvadevayāga and vājina-yāga is not the prayojaka of putting curds into milk [2155] (P. M. S. IV.1 22–24). The result is that, if by accident āmikṣā is destroyed, in order to secure the havis (āmikṣā) curds will have again to be put in boiled milk, but if *vājina*, not being prayojaka, is destroyed, curds need not be put into boiled milk again.

Examples of puruṣārtha acts have been given above (p. 1234) such as the Prājāpativrata. This chapter (in 2nd *pāda*) deals with several cases of pratipattikarma and arthakarma already explained above (pp. 1231–32). There are certain substances, certain embellishments and subsidiary actions with which some *phala* is associated. For example, it is said (in Tai. S. III. 7. 5. 2) 'he who has juhū ladle made of parṇa (palāśa) wood never hears an evil word about himself'; 'that he applies collyrium (to his eyes), he injures the eye of his enemy' (Tai. S. VI. I. 1. 5); 'That he performs the Prayājas and Anuyājas, that is indeed the armour of the sacrifice'. PMS declares that these texts about rewards associated with substances, embellishments and subsidiary acts are really not *vidhis* about rewards but are mere arthavādas, because all these serve the purpose of the principal kratu. [2156]

This fourth chapter (in 3rd pāda) also decides that, although no reward is expressly declared by Śruti (the Veda) for the performance of the Viśvajit sacrifice, still in the Viśvajit sacrifice (and in other sacrifices where no reward is expressly mentioned) svarga is the reward. [2157]

The Viśvajit is a striking sacrifice in which the performer donates all belongings of which he is the owner ('Viśvajiti sarva-

---

2155. तस्मादामिक्षा प्रयोक्त्री वाजिनमप्रयोजकमिति । शबर on III. 1. 23; यदुभय प्रयोजकं वाजिने नष्टे पुनस्तस्मे पयसि दध्यानेतव्यम् । अथ वाजिनमप्रयोजकं नष्टे वाजिने लोपो दध्यानयनस्य । शबर on IV. 1. 24.

2156. द्रव्यसंस्कारकर्मसु परार्थत्वात्फलश्रुतिरर्थवादः स्यात् । पू. मी. सू. IV. 3. 10; शबर quotes among others the following three passages: यस्य पर्णमयी जुहूर्भवति न स पापं श्लोकं शृणोति (द्रव्य), यदाङ्क्ते... चक्षुरेव भ्रातृव्यस्य वृङ्क्ते (संस्कार), यत्प्रयाजानुयाजा इज्यन्ते वर्म वा एतद्यज्ञस्य क्रियते (कर्म).

2157. स स्वर्गः स्यात्सर्वान्प्रत्यविशिष्टत्वात् । पू. मी. सू. IV. 3. 15. सर्वान् means सर्वपुरुषान्. शबर explains 'सर्वे हि पुरुषाः स्वर्गकामाः । कुत एतत् । प्रीतिर्हि स्वर्गः । सर्वश्च प्रीतिं प्रार्थयते ।; मेधा. on मनु II. 2. refers to it; vide परा. मा. I. 1. p. 148. The विष्णुपुराण II. 6. 46 has: मनःप्रीतिकरः स्वर्गो नरकस्तद्विपर्ययः । नरकस्वर्गसंज्ञे वै पुण्यपापे द्विजोत्तम ॥

svam dadāti'). Jaimini devotes about fourteen adhikaraṇas[2158] to it, viz. IV. 3. 10–16 (three adhikaranas), VI. 7. 1–20 (nine adhikaraṇas), VII. 3. 6–11 (one adhi.), X. 6. 13–14 (one adhi.). Some of the interesting propositions are: the performer cannot donate his own relatives (such as father or mother) but can denote that of which he is real owner or master; that even the emperor cannot make a gift of the whole kingdom, as other people have rights over land and the king protects the people and has only the right to a certain share in the produce of the land; that the performer cannot donate horses as śruti expressly forbids the gift of horses in Viśvajit; that the performer can donate only that which exists as his property at the time of giving dakṣiṇā in the sacrifice and not that which may become his at a future date; that a śūdra[2159] who waits upon the performer because it is his duty to serve (acc. to Manu) cannot be donated; a person of a higher varṇa cannot be donated; only he who has 112 cows or more wealth is entitled to perform Viśvajit.

The 5th adhyāya of P. M. S. deals with *krama* (the order in which the several component parts or acts that go to make up a sacrifice are to come one after another). Vidhis speak of the performance of many acts in a sacrifice and do not always lay down the order in which those acts (principal and auxiliary) are to be performed. It would not do to perform them in any order that the performer likes. For determining the order of sequence of several acts in a sacrifice one has to depend upon six means[2160] viz. śruti (direct assertion as to order), artha

---

2158. स्वदाने सर्वमविशेषात् (पूर्वपक्ष)। यस्य वा प्रभुः स्यादितरस्याशक्यत्वात् (सिद्धान्त)। IV. 7. 1–2; vide H. of Dh, vol. II pp. 849–50 which summarise PMS, VI. 7. 1–7, व्य. म. p. 92. विश्वजिति ... ददाति occurs in कौषी. ब्रा. 25. 14. मेधा॰ remarks "कृत्स्नगोलकाभिप्रायमेव चादेयत्वं भूमेर्विश्वजिति मीमांसकैरुक्तं 'न भूमिः स्यात्'। सर्वान् पुरुषान् प्रति चङ्क्रमणादियोग्यतयाऽविशिष्टा भूमिः स्वामीकर्तुमशक्या कथं दीयते इत्यर्थः ॥".

2159. शूद्रश्च धर्मशास्त्रत्वात्। VI. 7. 6; vide व्य. म. p. 93, and notes p. 132 thereon; एकमेव तु शूद्रस्य प्रभुः कर्म समादिशत्। एतेषामेव वर्णानां शुश्रूषामनसूयया ॥; मनु I. 91 and X. 123; vide H. of Dh. vol. II, p. 182 n. 424 for शबर's words. विकारः सत्युभयतोऽविशेषात्। अधिकं वा प्रतिप्रसवात्। अनुग्रहाच्च पादवत्। पू. मी. सू. VI. 7. 18–20; तत्र च द्वादशशतमधिकं वा सर्वस्वम्। इहापि तद्वदेव। तस्माच्च न्यूनधनस्याधिकारः। शबर; the पञ्चविंश (ताण्ड्य) ब्रा. has तस्य द्वादशं शतं दक्षिणाः (16. 1. 10–11).

2160. इहेदानीं क्रमनियमलक्षणमुच्यते। तच्छ्रुत्यर्थ-पाठ-प्रवृत्ति-काण्ड-मुख्यैर्वक्ष्यते। श्रुत्यादीनां च बलाबलम्। शबर on पू. मी. सू. V. 1. 1. It may be noticed that both अर्थसंग्रह and मी. न्या. प्र. slightly differ from Śabara in the order and names of the six means viz. as तत्र षट् प्रमाणानि श्रुत्यर्थपाठस्थानमुख्यप्रवृत्त्याख्यानि। तत्र क्रमो नाम विततिविशेषः पौर्वापर्यरूपो वा। अर्थसंग्रह p. 12 and मी. न्या. प्र. p. 173;

(purpose, suitability), pāṭha (verbal texts), pravṛtti (commencement), kāṇḍa (place in the texts), mukhya (principal).

In the Vedic passage about the dīkṣā in a sattra, the *adhvaryu, after performing the dīkṣā (initiation rite)* on the gṛhapati (the *yajamāna*, the performer of the sacrifice) performs dīkṣā on the brahmā priest, then on udgātṛ etc. the Vedic text directly lays down the sequence (by means of the termination 'tvā') that the dīkṣā of brahmā priest comes after the dīkṣā of the yajamāna. In the passage 'samidho yajati tanūnapātam yajati &c'. the very order in which the sentences occur in the text (i. e. pāṭha) determines the order of the performance of the several yāgas (PMS V. 1. 4). The Veda first speaks of the offering of Agnihotra and then of the cooking of gruel. Here the offering of Agnihotra comes first and preparation of gruel comes after that. But, unless the material to be offered is ready, no Agnihotra offering can be made. Therefore, here the pāṭhakrama *has to be given up and* arthakrama *(order as dictated by* the purpose and suitability) has to be followed i. e. first gruel must be prepared and then Agnihotra offered.[2161] This is an example showing that arthakrama is more powerful than pāṭhakrama (PMS V. 4. 1). The Parāśarasmṛti lays down that every day one should perform *sandhyā* (morning adoration), bath, japa (muttering of sacred texts), *homa*, study of the Veda, worship of gods, Vaiśvadeva and feeding guests. The Par. M. says that[2162] setting aside the *pāṭhakrama* one must follow the suitability and therefore bath comes first and *sandhyā* afterwards. The Sm. C. quotes Vṛddhamanu to the effect that a childless chaste widow should offer piṇḍa to her deceased husband and take his wealth. Here it is proper to hold that she should first take his wealth and then perform his śrāddhas. In the Vājapeya the text says that the performer (yajamāna) has to tie to the sacrificial post seventeen paśus to be offered to Prajāpati (Tai. Br. I. 3. 4.

2161. अग्निहोत्रं जुहोतीति पूर्वमाम्नातम्, ओदनं पचतीति पश्चात्। असम्भवात् पूर्वमोदनः पक्तव्यः। शबर *on* V. 1. 3. Vide also शबर on V. 4. 1.

2162. सन्ध्या स्नानं जपो होमो देवतातिथिपूजनम्। आतिथ्यं वैश्वदेवं च षट्कर्माणि दिने दिने॥ पराशरस्मृति I. 39 ; vide परा. मा. I. 2. 18 that says " सन्ध्यास्नानमित्यत्र यवागूपाकन्यायेन स्नानस्य प्राथम्यं व्याख्येयम्।...' यवाग्वाग्निहोत्रं जुहोति यवागूं च पचति ' इति श्रूयते।... यवाग्वा इति तृतीयया श्रुत्या होमसाधनत्वावगमादसति च द्रव्ये होमानिष्पत्तेरर्थाद् यवागूपाकः पूर्वभावीति सिद्धान्तः। एवमत्रापि स्नानस्य शुद्धिहेतुत्वाच्छुद्धस्यैव सन्ध्याकर्माधिकारित्वात्स्नानं पूर्वभावीति द्रष्टव्यम्। वृद्धमनुः—अपुत्रा शयनं भर्तुः पालयन्ती व्रते स्थिता। पत्न्येव दद्यात्तत्पिण्डं कृत्स्नमंशं लभेत च॥ and remarks ' उभयार्थे त्वर्थक्रमेण पाठक्रमबाधो द्रष्टव्यः। तत्रायमर्थः। उक्तलक्षणा पत्न्येव भर्त्रंशं कृत्स्नं लभेत पश्चात्पिण्डं दद्यात्। न पुनस्तस्यां सत्यां भ्रात्रादिरिति। स्मृतिच. II. p. 291.

2-3). It is also provided that each of the 17 *paśus* should have several saṁskāras performed on it such as *prokṣaṇa* (consecration by sprinkling sacred water on it), upākaraṇa (bringing near). One may take any of the 17 animals first and begin to perform the first of the saṁskāras on it; but having once begun with a particular animal he must perform the second and other saṁskāras one after another on the same animal; i. e. the order of the saṁskāras on an animal is determined by the commencement. *Kāṇḍa* or *sthāna* is exemplified as follows: The Jyotiṣṭoma is the model sacrifice (prakṛti) of which Sādyaskra is a vikṛti (modification). It is prescribed by the Veda in the case of Sādyaskra that all animals should be sacrificed together at the savanīya stage.[2163] In Jyotiṣṭoma, there are three animals offered viz. 'agnīṣomīya' in the morning, 'savanīya' in the noon and 'anubandhya' in ths evening. Sādyaskra, being a vikṛti, all these have to be performed in it; but the particular text about it provides that all three must be sacrificed together at the *savanīya* stage. This (offering all three simultaneously) is impossible and therefore all that can be done is to offer (them) one after another (and not at three different times in the day); it would appear at first sight that the Agnīṣomīya paśu comes first; but that is not so, since simultaneous offerings being laid down at the savanīya stage in sādyaskrayāga, the savanīya-paśu is to be first offered (and not Agnīṣomīya) and then the Agnīṣomīya immediately after and then Anubandhya or these two may be offered in any order one likes (but immediately).

An example of sequence being determined by the mukhya (first or principal) is: there is a śruti passage 'two Sārasvata offerings are to be made; this is indeed a divine couple'.[2164]

2163. अतः प्राजापत्येष्वेकं पदार्थं सर्वेष्वनुष्ठाय द्वितीयः पदार्थोऽनुष्ठेयः। तत्र प्रथमपदार्थानुष्ठानं कस्माच्चित्पशोरारभ्य कार्यम्। द्वितीयस्तु पदार्थो येन क्रमेण प्रथमोऽनुष्ठितस्तेनैव क्रमेणानुष्ठेयः प्रयोगविध्यवगतस्य मिथोऽङ्गसाहित्यस्योपपत्तये। मी. न्या. प्र. pp. 189–190.

2164. सारस्वतौ भवत एतद्वै दैव्यं मिथुनं दैव्यमेवास्मै मिथुनं मध्यतो दधाति पुष्ट्यै प्रजननाय। तै. सं. II. 4. 6. 1–2. This occurs in relation to चित्रायाग in which seven subsidiary offerings are prescribed of which two are सारस्वत. सारस्वतौ means 'सरस्वतीदेवताकः सरस्वद्देवताकश्चेत्युभौ सारस्वतौ'. The पू. मी. सू. is 'मुख्यक्रमेणाङ्गानां तदर्थत्वात्' (V. 1. 14 शा.) याज्ञ. II. 135 mentions as heirs to a man dying sonless, his wife, daughter and parents (पितरौ). Suppose a man dies leaving his father and mother as nearest relatives, who should succeed, viz. whether mother should be preferred to father or *vice versa* or whether both should take the estate equally. The मिताक्षरा prefers the mother to the father, the Sm. C. refers to this instance of सारस्वतौ भवतः and there being

(*Continued on next page*)

Details are provided as regards the two offerings to Sarasvatī and Sārasvata. The doubt arises: are the details about the offering to be made to the female deity to be performed first or are they to be first performed as the offerings to the male deity? The prima facie view being that as no *śāstra* exists regulating priority one may do as one likes, the established conclusion is that the order of sequence in the case of the details should be determined by the order of the Yājyānuvākyā verses. These are mentioned first about the female deity in the words 'pra ṇo devī Sarasvatī' (Tai. S. I. 8. 22. 1, Ṛg. VI. 61. 4). Therefore, the conclusion is that in the details also the offering to the female deity should come first.

In PMS V. 1. 16 it is decided that the order expressed in mantras should be followed in preference to the order contained in Brāhmaṇa texts.[2165] The Darśapūrṇamāsa sacrifice is made up of three component sacrifices, Āgneya, Upāṁśu and the Agnīṣomīya. In Tai S. II. 5. 2. 3, the Agnīṣomīya sacrifice is first described and in Tai. II. 6. 3. 3 the Āgneya is described. But these are held to be Brāhmaṇa texts, though now appearing in the Saṁhitā texts, since they lay down a vidhi; but in the Mantrapāṭha the Āgneya mantra 'Agnir-mūrdhā' (Tai. B. III. 5. 7. 1) is first set out and then follows the mantra 'Agnīṣomā savedasā' (Tai. Br. III. 5. 7. 2). Therefore, the Āgneya is to be first performed and the Agnīṣomīya afterwards.

If there are several deities or brāhmaṇas to be honoured with several acts or things, or there are several yūpas (sacrificial posts) as in Aikādaśina animal sacrifice on which several saṁskāras are to be performed from *añjana* to *parivyāṇa* (sur-

---

(*Continued from last page*)

no special ground of choice between the two, holds that the father takes first following certain other smṛtis like Bṛhat-Viṣṇu. The Dāyabhāga prefers the father to the mother and several works like the Vyavahāraprakāśa, (p. 524), the Madanaratna (p. 364) do the same. The words of the स्मृतिच. (II. p 297) are "सारस्वतौ भवतः इत्युत्पत्तिवाक्ये क्रमाश्रवणमात्रेण याज्याक्रमात् प्रधानयोः क्रमः पञ्चमे दर्शितो न पुनः सारस्वतावित्येकशेषात एव कथंचित् क्रमावगतिरुपपादितेति निबन्धमेव (?) मातुः प्राथम्यसमर्थनम्। अत एव श्रीकरेण पित्रोर्धनग्रहणमुक्तं तदप्ययुक्तम्। ... दौहित्राभावे पितृगामित्यमवगन्तव्यम्।. 'पञ्चमे' in the above passage refers to fifth *adhyāya* of P. M. S.

2165. पदार्थबोधकवाक्यानां यः क्रमः स पाठक्रमः। तस्माच्च पदार्थानां क्रम आश्रीयते। येन हि क्रमेण वाक्यानि पठितानि तेनैव क्रमेणाधीतान्यर्थप्रत्ययं जनयन्ति। यथार्थप्रत्ययं च पदार्थानामनुष्ठानात्। स च पाठक्रमो द्विविधः मन्त्रपाठो ब्राह्मणपाठश्च। तत्राग्नेयाग्नीषोमीययोः स्तवयाज्यानुवाक्याक्रमाच्चः क्रम आश्रीयते स मन्त्रपाठात्। स चायं मन्त्रपाठो ब्राह्मणपाठाद् बलवान्। अनुष्ठाने ब्राह्मणवाक्यापेक्षया मन्त्रवाक्यस्यान्तरङ्गत्वात्। मी. न्या. प्र. pp. 176-177.

founding with a girdle), then one should perform all the saṁskāras from añjana to parivyāṇa on the yūpa first and then all these on the 2nd and so on up to the last yūpa or whether one should perform añjana on all yūpas one after another, the next saṁskāra on all yūpas one after another and so on till the last saṁskāra of parivyāna is done on all yūpas one after another. The former way is called kāṇḍānusamaya and the latter 'padārthānusamaya'.[2166] Jai. V. 2. 7–9 refers to the first method and Jai. V. 2. 1–3 to the 2nd. Vide for the explanation and illustration of these two, H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 739–740, p. 1132 n 2528 and Vol. IV. pp. 441–42 n 987. On Yāj. I. 232 ('apasavyam tataḥ kṛtvā) the Mit. remarks that the performer of Śrāddha follows the kāṇḍānusamaya method for the Vaiśvadeva brāhmaṇas i. e. gives them water for washing the feet, then ācamana, seat, sandalwood paste, flowers &c, then he should wear the sacred thread on the right shoulder and offer the upacāras to the pitrya brāhmanas.

The sixth adhyāya of PMS is a very interesting one. It deals with the various aspects of the question of adhikāra, that is, qualifications of the performer of a sacrifice. It is a very extensive chapter having eight pādas like chap. III and X. A few of the numerous propositions contained therein that have influenced the works on Dharmśāstra have already been set out, such as women's right to participate in Vedic sacrifices, śūdra's ineligibility for them, the rathakāranyāya and niṣādasthapatinyāya and a few more will be dealt with here. As a preliminary Jaimini establishes (in P. M. S. VI. 1. 1–3) that in such texts as 'one desirous of heaven should offer the Darśapūrṇamāsa sacrifice or one should offer the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice' the Veda prescribes *yāga* for one who desires heaven i. e. heaven is the principal (or predominant) factor while yāga is subsidiary or subordinate; thereby it follows that the Vedic text lays down the characteristics of the performer. The Ṭupṭīkā says that[2167]

2166. On जै. V. 2. 1–3 पार्थसारथि states 'प्रथमं पदार्थं सर्वेषां कृत्वा ततो द्वितीयः कर्तव्यः । एवं दर्शपूर्णमासादिष्वनेकप्रधानसमवाये पदार्थानुसमय एव न्याय्यो न काण्डानुसमय इति स्थितम् ।' शास्त्रदीपिका । p. 421; ... गार्ग्यनारायण on आश्व. गृ. सू. I. 24. 7 explains तत्र पदार्थानुसमयो नाम सर्वेषां चरणक्रमेण विष्टरं दत्त्वा ततः पाद्यं ततोऽर्घ्यमिति । काण्डानुसमयो नाम एकस्यैवं विष्टरादिगोनिवेदनान्तं समाप्य ततोऽन्यस्य सर्वं ततोऽन्यस्येति ।. The व्य. म. (p. 66) refers to पदार्थानुसमय in the worship of deities in the balance ordeal.

2167. तस्मात्स्वर्गकामस्य यागकर्मोपदेशः स्यात् । अतः स्वर्गः प्रधानतः कर्म गुणतः इति स्वर्गकाममधिकृत्य यजेतेति वचनमित्यधिकारलक्षणमिदं सिद्धम् । शबर on पू. मी. सू. VI. 1.3;

(*Continued on next page*)

'adhikārī is the owner (or master) who stands above all actions (yāga).' Another more elaborate definition is given as 'adhikārī is one who desires some reward (such as heaven or happiness), who is possessed of the capacity to perform the act prescribed, who has learning and who is not excluded from performing a sacrifice (by Śruti)'. Even lower animals desire happiness; hence to exclude them the words 'possessed of the capacity' &c. are added. A man may be totally ignorant and so the word 'vidvān' is added; a śūdra may desire happiness, may have capacity and be also learned but he is excluded by the vedic text, 'Therefore the Śūdra is not fit (or ordained) for sacrifice'.

In VI. I. 39–40 it is established[2168] that every man belonging to one of the three higher classes has a right to perform Vedic sacrifices. A man though at one time devoid of wealth may acquire wealth by various means. Similarly, it is said in VI. 1. 41 that one who is defective in a limb is just like one who is devoid of wealth i. e. such a man has a right to offer Vedic sacrifices provided he takes steps to remove the weakness. In VI. 1. 42 it is further provided that if the defect is congential and incurable, the person who suffers from such a defect is not entitled to perform Vedic sacrifices.

(Continued from last page)

अधिकारीति कर्मणामुपरिभावेनावस्थितः स्वामीत्यर्थः। टुप्टीका (on same); अर्थी समर्थो विद्वान् शास्त्रेणापर्युदस्तोधिकारी। सर्वदर्शनकौमुदी p. 103. This summarises in one place what Śabara and Kumārila state in different places e. g. न चैतदस्ति तिर्यगादीनामप्यधिकार इति। कस्य तर्हि। यः समर्थः कृत्स्नं कर्माभिनिर्वर्तयितुम्। न देवानां देवतान्तराभावात्। न ह्यात्मानमुद्दिश्य त्यागः सम्भवति। त्याग एवासौ न स्यात्। ... अपि च तिर्यञ्चो न कालान्तरफलेनार्थिनः। आसन्नं हि ते कामयन्ते। ... न चैते (तिर्यञ्चः) वेदमधीयते नापि स्मृतिशास्त्राणि। नाप्यन्येभ्योऽवगच्छन्ति। तस्मान्न विदन्ति धर्मम्। अविद्वांसः कथमनुतिष्ठेयुः। शबर on पू. मी. सू. VI. 1.5. शूद्रो मनुष्याणामश्वः पशूनां तस्मात्तौ भूतसंक्रामिणावश्वश्च शूद्रश्च। तस्माच्छूद्रो यज्ञेऽनवक्लृप्तः। तै. सं. VII. 1. 1. 6. सायण explains अनवक्लृप्तः as यज्ञे प्रवर्तितुं न योग्यः.

2168. त्रयाणां द्रव्यसंपन्नः कर्मणो द्रव्यसिद्धित्वात् (पूर्वपक्ष)। अनित्यत्वात्तु नैवं स्यादर्थाद्धि द्रव्यसंयोगः। अङ्गहीनश्च तद्धर्मा। उत्पत्तौ नित्यसंयोगात्। पू. मी. सू. VI. 1. 39–42; तद्धर्मा means 'द्रव्यरहितधर्मा तत्तुल्य इति'. The last sūtra may be paraphrased as उत्पत्तौ एव येषामङ्गवैकल्यं जात्यन्धादीनां सर्वेषामप्रतिसमाधेयाङ्गवैकल्यानां ते नाधिक्रियन्ते आज्यावेक्षणादिभिः।. क्रतोर्नित्यसंयोगात्।. तै. सं. VI. 3. 10.5 states 'जायमानो ह वै ब्राह्मणस्त्रिभिर्ऋणवा जायते ब्रह्मचर्येण ऋषिभ्यो यज्ञेन देवेभ्यः प्रजया पितृभ्य एष वा अनृणो यः पुत्री यज्वा ब्रह्मचारिवासी'. On this, पू. मी. सू. VI. 2. 31 is ब्राह्मणस्य सोमविद्याप्रजमृणवाक्येन संयोगात्', on which शबर explains that the word brāhmaṇa is only illustrative 'ब्राह्मणग्रहणं तु प्रदर्शनार्थम्। जायमानो ब्राह्मणो राजन्यो वैश्यश्चेति। तथा जायमानो जातश्चेति।'.

The ancient and medieval Hindu law of inheritance and succession was modelled on this. Vide Yāj. II. 140, Manu IX. 201 and Nārada (dāyabhāga, verses 21–22). Yāj. II. 140 declares that the impotent, the outcast and his son, a lame man, a lunatic, an idiot, a blind man and a person afflicted with an incurable disease are not entitled to a share, but are entitled to receive maintenance. This subject has been dealt with in H. of Dh. Vol. III. pp. 610–612. The Mit. on Yāj. II. 140 provides that the grounds of disqualification apply to males and females alike. But the recent Hindu Succession Act (No. 32 of 1956) sweeps away all these grounds of disqualification by providing that no person shall be disqualified from succeeding to any property on the ground of any disease, defect or deformity or, save as provided in this act, on any other ground whatever (section 28).

A good many sūtras (in chap. VI. 3. 17–41) deal with what are called 'pratinidhi' (substitute, representative or proxy). These have been described in H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 684' 1110, 1203, Vol. III. pp. 471, 637, 653. 654 (where Satyāṣāḍha Śr' S. III containing similar rules is mentioned). A few of them are briefly mentioned here. The first rule is that if the substance declared by the Veda for preparing an offering perishes or is lost as regards an obligatory rite or as regards *kāmya* rite that is already begun, one should substitute another substance (like nīvāras, wild rice grains) for *vrīhi* (rice grains) or *yava* i. e, barley grains and finish the rite (VI. 3 13–17). In some cases Vedic texts prescribe a substitute for the substance required to be used, as in 'if he (the performer) cannot obtain the Soma plant, he should substitute pūtīka stalks and extract juice therefrom.' It is argued by the objector that, as the Veda expressly substitutes pūtīkas for soma, one should conclude that where Veda does not expressly mention a substitute for a prescribed substance, it means that a substitute is not allowed by the Veda in other cases. The siddhānta is that the prescribing of pūtīkas as substitute is a restrictive rule[2169] viz. that although several plants may resemble soma, there is a restriction that only pūtīkas should be substituted. It is provided (in III. 6. 37, 39) that when a substitute like nīvāras is employed, the subsidiary acts of sprinkling with water, pounding with mortar and pestle that are performed on rice or barley grains should also be per-

2169. नियमार्थः क्वचिद्विधिः । VI. 3. 16; सोमाभावे बहुषु सदृशेषु प्राप्तेषु नियमः क्रियते पूतीका एवाभिषोतव्या इति । शबर. The ताण्ड्यब्राह्मण (IX. 5. 3) provides 'यदि सोमं न विन्देयुः' which is quoted in n. 2001 above.

formed on them. When rice grains are employed the mantra expressly speaks of the rice offering as the sap or essence of rice grains. There adaptation (*ūha*) is to be made as 'nīvārāṇām medha' (vide PMS IX. 3. 1-2).[2170] But in certain cases no substitute is allowed viz. the devatā with respect to which an *havis* (offering) is prescribed cannot have another substituted in a rite e. g. 'Āgneyoṣṭākapālaḥ' cannot be changed into 'aindroṣṭākapālaḥ', since in that case the rite will cease to be what was intended. Similarly, when the text says 'he offers into the Āhavanīya fire,' one cannot substitute the Gārhapatya fire; another mantra cannot be substituted for the one prescribed nor can other rites be substituted for the Prayājas 'samidho yajati' &c.).[2171]

The Veda forbids the use of *varakas*, *kodravas* and *māṣas* as unfit for a sacrifice. If a person mistakenly takes māṣa grains or particles believing them to be *mudga* grains or particles and uses them in a sacrifice in which an oblation of boiled mudga pulse is prescribed, he will not be performing the desired rite as what is forbidden as unfit cannot be a substitute.[2172]

This nyāya is relied upon by the Mit. on Yāj. II. 126 (which simply states that if joint family properties are suppressed or concealed by some members and kept for themselves, they should be distributed in equal shares even after partition (when this is found out), which holds that this verse cannot be interpreted so as to absolve the concealer of such joint property from guilt simply on the ground that he was himself a part owner and explains that just as a sacrificer mistakenly believing māṣa particles as mudga ones loses the fruit of the sacrifice, so the concealer of joint property is guilty of wrong. The Vyavahāraprakāśa (p. 555) and Aparārka p. 732 take the same view, but the Dāyabhāga (XII. 11-13) and V. R. (p. 526) are opposed to this (vide H. of Dh. Vol. III. p. 636). The Prāyaścittatattva p. 482 has an elaborate note on this nyāya.

2170. अस्ति तु प्रकृतौ व्रीहिलिङ्गो मन्त्रः—स्योनं ते सदनं ... प्रतितिष्ठ व्रीहीणां मेध सुमनस्यमान इति। शबर on IX. 3. 1. This is तै. ब्रा. VII. 7. 5. 2-3. मेध means सारभूत.

2171. न देवताग्निशब्दक्रियमन्यार्थसंयोगात्। पू. मी. सू. VI. 3. 18.

2172. प्रतिषिद्धं चाविशेषेण हि तच्छ्रुतिः। VI. 3. 20; प्रतिषिद्धं च न प्रतिनिधातव्यमिति। अविशेषेण ह्येतदुच्यते—न यज्ञार्हा माषा वरका कोद्रवाश्चेति। शबर. The सूत्र may be explained as प्रतिषिद्धं माषादिकं न प्रतिनिधेयं यस्मात् अविशेषेण यज्ञसम्बन्धमात्रे निषेधश्रुतिः।. The तै. सं. V. 1. 8. 1 has 'अमेध्या वै माषाः'; vide H. of Dh. vol. III, p. 637 and note 1209 for Jaimini's sūtra and the quotation from the Mit.

Another rule is that there can be no substitute for the performer of the sacrifice (VI. 3. 21), since (in Jai. III. 7. 18–20) it is laid down that the fruit of the rite belongs to the owner, though after beginning the rite he leaves everything to the priests engaged to perform the rite. The only exception is in the case of *sattras* (Jai. VI. 3. 22) performed by many persons together acting both as performers and as priests.

One important adhikaraṇa is VI. 7. 31–40. There is a Sattra called 'Viśvasṛjām-ayanam' which is said to last for 1000 saṁvatsaras. After referring to Tai. Br. I. 3. 7. 7 and I. 7. 6. 2 (śatāyuḥ puruṣaḥ) and to the views of Kārṣṇājini and Lāvukāyana, Jaimini boldly establishes the conclusion that *saṁvatsara* here means day. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II p. 1246 n. 2683 for the *Mahābhāṣya* stating that the Yājñikas in speaking about such sattras only follow the tradition handed down by ancient sages. Medhātithi on Manu I. 84 ('vedoktam-āyur-martyānām) has a long note wherein he refers to the viw of Jaimini, quotes 'śatāyur vai puruṣaḥ' and also 'śatam-innu śarado anti devā' (Ṛg. I. 89. 9) and cites the views of other interpreters. The Kātyāyana Śr. (I. 6. 17–27) discusses this very subject at great length, refers to the differing interpretations of Bharadvāja, Kārṣṇājini and Laugākṣi but ultimately holds that saṁvatsara means 'day' here.

In the first six chapters of the P. M. S. the procedure of such rites as Darśapūrṇamāsa the details of which are expressly laid down by the Veda has been considered. In the six chapters from the 7th consideration will be given to sacrifices like Aindrāgna, the procedure of which is not expressly laid down by the Veda.[2173] In the 7th chapter what is considered is whether in the vikṛtis (sacrifices that are modifications of the model sacrifices) details have to be added and, if so, which and how many of the details have to be carried out.

The 7th chapter deals with the general question of the extension or transference of details in general (i. e. *atideśa* in general) to Aindrāgna and other sacrifices. *Atideśa* is the

---

2173. The न्यायरत्नमाला (in G. O. S.) 4th परिच्छेद p. 257 says: एवं तावदौपदेशिकाङ्गसम्बन्धप्रकारः सप्रमाणकः पूर्वाध्यायषट्कगोचरः प्रदर्शितः। इदानीमातिदेशिकाङ्गसम्बन्धविधानं प्रतिपाद्यते। द्विविधं हि शब्दजातमुपदेशात्मकमतिदेशात्मकं च। इत्थमिदं कर्तव्यमित्युपदेशः, तद्वदिदं कर्तव्यमित्यतिदेशः।'; अतिदेशो नाम ये परत्र विहिता धर्मास्तमतीत्यान्यत्र तेषां देशः।... यथा देवदत्तवद्यज्ञदत्तो भोजयितव्य इति। श्लोकमप्युदाहरन्ति। प्रकृतात्कर्मणो यस्मात्तत्समानेषु कर्मसु। धर्मप्रदेशो येन स्यात् सोऽतिदेश इति स्थितिः॥ इति। 'स च नाम्ना वचनेन वा। वचनं पुनर्द्विविधं प्रत्यक्षश्रुतमानुमानिकं च। शबर on जै. VII, 1. 12.

process or method by which the details prescribed in connection with one rite are taken beyond that rite and transferred to another. Śabara quotes from some ancient author a śloka defining atideśa. The sacrifice from which details are transferred is called *prakṛti* (model or Archetype) and the sacrifice to which details are transferred or extended is called vikṛti (or Ectype). Atideśa may be provided for by *vacana* (Vedic text) or by the name. The first is of two kinds viz. by a direct statement or by an inferential process. For example, as regards a magic sacrifice called Isu the text says, after speaking of some details, that the rest are the same as in [2174] Śyena. An instance of an inferential *vacana* is the extension to the Saurya sacrifice of the details of the Āgneya in Darśapūrṇamāsa, because both are very closely connected and because no details are prescribed by the text about 'Sauryayāga' (PMS VII. 4. 1). The name also is two-fold, viz. name of a rite and name of a *saṁskāra*. The Māsāgnihotra prescribed (vide PMS II. 3. 24) in Kuṇḍapāyinām-ayana is a different rite from the obligatory Agnihotra (as in 'yāvajjīvam-agnihotram juhuyāt') as proved above, but the name 'agnihotra' being common to both, the details of the usual Agnihotra (such as milking the cow, offering curds or milk, using a Khadira fuel stick &c.) are to be extended to Māsāgnihotra (Jai. VII. 3. 1–4). Extension due to saṁskāra name is instanced in Jai. VII. 3. 12–15. In the Varuṇapraghāsa (one of the cāturmāsyas), Avabhṛtha (bath) is prescribed, but no details are added and therefore the requisite details are to be taken from the rules about the Avabhṛtha in Somayāga. [2175]

Atideśa is frequently resorted to by smṛtis and digests. For example, Yāj. I. 236 and 242 extend the procedure of Piṇḍapitṛyajña as regards *Agnaukaraṇa* and offering of piṇḍas to the Pārvaṇaśrāddha. The Parāśarasmṛti (VII. 18–19) speaks [2176]

2174. अस्तीषुर्नाम एकाहः। अपरः श्येनः। तौ द्वावप्याभिचारिकौ तत्रैषौ कांश्चिद्धर्मान्विधायाह समानमितरच्छ्येनेनेति। शबर on VII. 1. 13. समा ... नेन is आप. श्रौ. 22. 7. 18.

2175. तथावभृथः सोमात्। जै. VII. 3. 12; वरुणप्रघासेषु श्रूयते। वारुण्या निष्कासेन तुषैश्चावभृथं यन्तीति। यथा षड्ढोतृप्रष्ठानामतिदेश एवं सौमिकादवभृथादिह धर्मातिदेशः। कुतः। अभिहितो न्यायः। उक्तं क्रियाभिधानं तच्छ्रुतावन्यत्र विधिप्रदेशः स्यात्-इति। उक्तं ... स्यात् is जै. VII. 3. 1,

2176. प्रथमेऽहनि चण्डाली द्वितीये ब्रह्मघातिनी। तृतीये रजकी प्रोक्ता चतुर्थेऽहनि शुध्यति॥ पराशर VII. 18–19, on which परा. मा. (vol. II. 1. pp. 168–169) remarks 'चण्डाल्यादिगमने यावान् प्रत्यवायस्तावाञ्छुद्रकयागमने इत्यभिप्रेत्य तैर्नामभिर्व्यवहारः। यथा कुण्डपायिनामयने मासमग्निहोत्रं जुहोतीत्यग्निहोत्रनामनिर्देशेन नित्याग्निहोत्रधर्मातिदेशस्तद्वत्।'.

of a woman in her monthly illness as a cāṇḍālī on the first day of the illness, as the murderess of a brāhmaṇa on the 2nd day and as a washerwoman on the 3rd day. The Par. M. remarks that the intention of calling such a woman by these names is to convey that intercourse with her will result in the same sin as would be incurred by a person of higher classes if he had intercourse with a cāṇḍālī &c. For an instance of express extension, vide V. M. pp. 56–57 when it quotes a verse of Pitāmaha on the balance ordeal (in which the word 'yūpavat' is used) and remarks that atideśa is prescribed expressly by the word 'yūpavat'.

The 8th chapter deals with specific cases of extension (atideśa). The Darśapūrṇamāsa is the prakṛti of all[2177] *iṣṭis* and 'Darśapūrṇamāsābhyām yajeta' is called *vidhyādi* and *vidhyanta* is the whole procedure of Darśapūrṇamāsa (except the originative injunction 'darśapūrṇamāsyābhyām yajeta) detailed in the Brāhmaṇas about the offering of puroḍāśa (cake) &c. In the Vikṛtiyāga called Saurya[2178] the sentence 'one who desires to secure the lustre of Vedic learning should offer boiled rice to the Sun' is the vidhyādi, but no details are mentioned there. There is an expectation of some procedure and, though there are numerous vidhyantas in relation to sacrifices, the special word '*nirvapati*' is indicative of the procedure of Darśapūrṇamāsa (in which also there is *nirvāpa*) and one comes to understand that the Saurya *caru* is offered as in Āgneya (the first rite in

2177. Vedic sacrifices are usually divided for convenience into three varieties, viz. *Iṣṭi* (in which offerings are of milk, clarified butter, rice, barley and other grains), Paśu and Soma and the latter again into Ekāha (lasting for one day like Agniṣṭoma), Ahīna (lasting for more than one day up to 12 days) and Sattra (lasting from 12 days to a year or more). Śabara on PMS IV. 4. 20 states that there are four Mahāyajñas, viz. Agnihotra, Darśapūrṇamāsa, Jyotiṣṭoma, Piṇḍapitṛyajña. There are seven Soma sacrifices as stated by Gaut. Dh. S. VIII. 18. Besides these Śrauta rites, there are other rites prescribed in the gṛhyasūtras, which are offered in *gṛhya* fire and seven important ones from which are called pākayajñas. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 193–194.

2178. विध्यन्तो वा प्रकृतिवच्चोदनायां प्रवर्तेत तथाहि लिङ्गदर्शनम्। पू. मी. सू. VII. 4. 10; वेदेऽपि दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां यजेतेति विध्यादिः। विध्यन्तोऽपि प्रधानविधिवर्जितं कृत्स्नं पौरोडाशिकं ब्राह्मणम्, तेन समेतोऽयं विध्यादिर्विशिष्टापूर्वनिर्वृत्तिं प्रति पुरुषं प्रवर्तयति। तस्मात्सोऽस्यान्तः। शबर; on पू. मी. सू. VIII. 1. 2 शबर explains: विध्यन्तापेक्षो यो वैकृतो विध्यादिः सोऽपि वैदिकेन विध्यन्तेनानुमानाद् बुद्धौ संनिहितेनैकवाक्यतां यास्यति। यथा सौर्यं चरुं निर्वपेद्ब्रह्मवर्चसकाम इति। तत्र कथमिति विध्यन्तापेक्षायामनेकविध्यन्तसंनिपातेऽसाधारणेन निर्वपतिशब्देन दार्शपौर्णमासिकविध्यन्तसंयोगिना लिङ्गेन तदीयो विध्यन्तः प्रसज्यते।

Darśapūrṇamāsa). The details of the prakṛti are to be performed in all other *iṣṭis* along with the few details that may have been stated expressly as to some.

The Jyotiṣṭoma is the prakṛti of all soma sacrifices of one day and of Dvādaśāhā and its details are performed in all modifications of soma sacrifices such as Atirātra. The Agnīṣomīya is the prakṛti of all sacrifices in which a paśu (animal) is to be sacrificed, the details of which are to be performed in all vikṛtis of paśuyāgas. Dvādaśāha is of two kinds, *Ahīna* and *Sattra* and is the prakṛti of all Ahīna sacrifices like Dvirātra, Trirātra up to Śatarātra; and Dvādaśāha of the sattra type is the model of all sattras. Gavām-ayana is the prakṛti of all sacrifices like Ādityānām-ayana. Darvihomas are *sui juris* and are not prakṛtis or vikṛtis of any other sacrifices. All these are considered in the 8th chapter.

The 9th chapter deals with *ūha* (adaptation). When applying the principle of *atideśa* certain alterations and adaptations are necessary in the matter of mantras, sāmans and saṁskāras. The word ūha ordinarily means only *tarka* or *vicāraṇā* (reasoning), yet in PMS it has a special meaning.[2179]

The Āgneya is the *prakṛti* in which the *nirvāpa* (offering) is to be made with the words 'I offer to Agni what is liked by him'; in the Sauryayāga, which is a vikṛti of Āgneya, the offering has to be made with the words 'I offer to Sūrya what is liked by him.' In the Vājapeya we read 'he offers to Bṛhaspati *nirvāpa* grains cooked on seventeen pans'. The Vājapeya is a modification of Darśapūrṇamāsa in which the grains of rice are sprinkled with water; therefore sprinkling has to be done on nīvāra grains also (PMS IX. 2. 40). On the 2nd and following days of the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice there is recitation of the Subrahmaṇyā litany[2180] addressed to Indra by the Subrahmaṇya priest, beginning with the words 'Indra āgaccha, hariva āgaccha, Medhātither-meṣa &c'. In the Agniṣṭut sacrifice also there is

---

2179. यद्यपि ऊहशब्दस्तर्कमात्रवचनस्तथाप्यस्मिन् शास्त्रेऽन्यथावगतानां पदार्थानामन्यथाभावविषयो यस्तर्कः स ऊहशब्देनोच्यते। न्या. र. मा, 4th परिच्छेद p. 263 ; vide न्यायसूत्र I. 1. 40 'अविज्ञाततत्त्वेऽर्थे कारणोपपत्तितस्तत्त्वज्ञानार्थमूहस्तर्कः'.

2180. तथा मेधातिथेर्मेष इत्येवमादि इतिहासवचनमिव प्रतिभाति इतिहासे च विधौ सति आदिमत्ता दोषो वेदस्य प्रसज्येत। ... तस्मादेते गुणा इन्द्रे विद्यन्त इत्यसमेतवचनत्वादविकारेण प्रयोग इति तदेतच्च रोचयन्ते याज्ञिकाः। ऊहं कुर्वन्ति। अग्न आगच्छ रोहिताश्व बृहद्भानो धूमकेतो जातवेदो विचर्षण इति। शबर on पू. मी. सू. IX. 1. 44.

Subrahmaṇyā-nigada[2181] addressed to Agni. In reciting it the word 'Agne' is substituted for 'Indra'; but the following words 'Hariva āgaccha' is are not to be changed and are to be recited, as they are attributes which may be predicated of Agni also (PMS IX. I. 42–44). The principle deduced by the Mīmāṁsakas seems to be that, only if the words in the original mantra cannot at all be extended to the modified yāga as they stand, then *ūha* may have to be resorted to but not otherwise. Śabara however, notes that the 'yājñikas perform *ūha* (i.e. adapt them by suitable changes) i.e. they recite 'agne āgaccha rohitāśva bṛhad-bhāno' etc.). It is noteworthy that, according to PMS II. 1.34 and Śabara thereon, a mantra as adapted (*ūhita*) is not called a mantra, since only those are mantras[2182] that are recognized as such by the learned. In the Darśapūrṇamāsa when the priest takes out four handfuls of grains and puts them in a winnowing basket he repeats over three of the handfuls the mantra which literally means 'at the command of God Savitṛ, with the arms of Aśvins and with the hands of Pūṣan I take out for Agni thee that art dear (to him)'.[2183] The PMS holds (in IX. 1. 36–37) that the words Savitṛ, Pūṣan, Aśvin are not to be changed by ūha in the modifications of Darśapūrṇamāsa where the deity to which the offering is to be made is not Agni. Śabara assigns rather far-fetched meanings to the words Savitṛ, Aśvins and Pūṣan (as in the note below) and says that they are meant to eulogize the laying aside of the handfuls of grains for offering. There is another interesting case where there is no

---

2181. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 1144–1146 and note 2550 for the Subrahmaṇyā-nigada and its meaning.

2182. अनाम्नातेष्वमन्त्रत्वमाम्नातेषु हि विभागः। पू. मी. सू. II. 1. 34; ऊहप्रवरनामधेयेषु संशयः—मन्त्रा उत नेति। अभिधायकत्वान्मन्त्रा इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः। अनाम्नातेषु मन्त्रत्वं न स्यादभिधायकेष्वपि। नाभिधायकत्वं मन्त्रत्वे हेतुः। किं तर्हि। अभियुक्तप्रयोगः। येऽभियुक्तैर्मन्त्रा इति नोच्यन्ते न ते मन्त्राः। न चैवमादयो मन्त्रसमाम्नाये सन्ति। तस्मादमन्त्राः। प्रयोजनं मन्त्रे भ्रष्टे यत्प्रायश्चित्तममन्त्रेषु तन्न। शबर.

2183. स्तो दर्शपूर्णमासौ। तत्र निर्वापमन्त्रः। देवस्य त्वा सवितुः प्रसवेऽश्विनोर्बाहुभ्यां पूष्णो हस्ताभ्यामग्नये जुष्टं निर्वपामीति। शबर on IX. 1. 36; देवस्य ... निर्वपामि occurs in तै. सं. II. 6. 4. 1. देवस्य सवितुः प्रसवे-देवेन सवित्रा यजमानेन प्रसूते, उदिते वा सवितरि। अश्विनोर्बाहुभ्यां परिक्रयमभिप्रेत्य यजमानयोर्दम्पत्योर्बाहुभ्याम्। अश्विनौ हि तौ अग्न्याधेयेऽश्वदानेन, अशितवन्तौ वा तद्यज्ञफलमश्नुवाते। तद्बाहू इति स्वौ बाहू व्यपदिशति। देवताध्वर्योऽश्विनोरेतौ बाहू इति। पूषणं तु यजमानमेव मन्यते पुष्णातेः। एवं सर्वे निर्वापप्रकाशनार्थाः। शबर on IX. 1. 37. The words 'परिक्रयमभिप्रेत्य' refer to the fact that the priest adhvaryu is engaged by the yajamāna as agent for a payment of fee and therefore adhvaryu's arms are yajamāna's arms.

ūha. In the Darśapūrṇamāsa there is a *praiṣa* (direction) 'set down[2184] the water for sprinkling, put down the fuel sticks and the bunch of kuśa grass, clean the *sruc* and *sruva* ladles, gird up the wife (of the sacrificer) and come out with clarified butter'. Suppose the sacrificer has two or more wives. Still the singular 'patnīm' was to be used and not the dual or plural either in the model itself (IX. 3. 20) or in any modification thereof (IX. 3. 21). Dharmaśāstra works make use of *ūha*. The Viṣṇudharmasūtra provides that one should perform Srāddha of one's maternal grand-father and the latter's two male ancestors in a similar way by the ūha of the mantra.[2185] The mantra in the case of the śrāddha of male ancestors is 'Śundhantām pitaraḥ' (Āp. Śr. I. 7. 13), which should be changed into 'Śundhantām mātāmahāḥ'; vide Mit. on Yāj. I. 254 and H. of Dh. Vol. IV p. 513 n. 1142a.

When in a sacrifice boiled rice is to be offered the mantra is 'syonam...vrīhīṇām medha sumanasyamānaḥ' (vide pp. 1298–99 n. 2125 above). If boiled rice is destroyed or not available and *nīvāra* grains are substituted, there is no ūha as 'nīvārāṇām medha' but the words 'vrīhīṇām medha' are to be retained (PMS IX. 3. 23–26), because, as stated in PMS VI. 3. 27 (sāmānyam tac-cikīrṣā hi), nīvāras are substituted on account of the similarity of parts of boiled *nīvāras* with the parts of rice grains.

In the third and fourth pādas of the 9th chapter there are twelve *adhikaraṇas* about the *adhrigu-praiṣa* recited by the Hotṛ in Paśubandha. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. p. 1121, note 2504 for that praiṣa. There is ūha to be made about certain words therein and PMS explains some of the unfamiliar and difficult words in that text.

The tenth chapter is the longest chapter in the PMS, having eight *pādas* and 577 sūtras (i. e. more than one-fifth of

---

2184. अपूर्वे त्वविकारोऽप्रदेशात्प्रतीयेत। पू. मी. सू. IX. 3. 20; दर्शपूर्णमासयोराम्नन्ति। प्रोक्षणीरासादयेध्माबर्हिरुपसादय स्रुचं च स्रुवश्च संमृड्ढि पत्नीं संनह्याज्येनोदेहीति। शबर on IX. 3. 20. The words प्रोक्षणी ... देहीति occur in आप. श्रौ. सू. II. 3. 11. This is तै. ब्रा. III. 2. 9. 14. Then शबर proceeds तत्र पत्नीं संनह्येति विचार्यते। अस्ति हि यजमान एकपत्नीको बहुपत्नीकश्च। ... इदं तु सन्दिह्यते। किं द्विपत्नीके बहुपत्नीके च प्रयोग ऊहितव्यः पत्नीशब्द उत नेति। ... एवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः। अपूर्वे तु अप्रकृतिपूर्वके कर्मणि अविकारेण प्रयुज्येत।. The next sūtra is विकृतौ चापि तद्वचनात्। IX. 3. 21.

2185. मातामहानामप्येवं श्राद्धं कुर्याद्द्विजोत्तमः। मन्त्रोहेन यथान्यायं शेषाणां मन्त्रवर्जितम्॥ विष्णुधर्मसूत्र 75. 8.

the total number of sūtras) just as the third (with 363 sutras) and the 6th (with 349 sutras) have eight *pādas* each. This chapter is concerned with *bādha* (annulment or exclusion) and *abhyuccaya* or samuccaya which is the exact opposite or antithesis of bādha. The general rule is that the details of the prakṛtiyāga (model sacrifice) should be taken over in the vikṛti (modification). But in some cases the vikṛti-yāga[2186] has a different name, some of the saṁskāras (purificatory and embellishing acts) and some of the substances (dravya) employed in the prakṛti cannot be extended to the vikṛtis, because there are express texts negativing their employment or because they serve no purpose or have become useless or senseless. Śabara states that *bādha* occurs when an idea or knowledge determined for certain as this type or that has to be understood as wrong owing to some (special) reason while abhyuccaya (addition or combination) occurs when even after we have the knowledge that certain matters are to be extended to the vikṛti there is the further idea that a few others also are to be additional in the vikṛti.

The Mai. S. prescribes that one desirous[2187] of long life should offer a lump of one hundred *kṛṣṇalas* (golden pieces shaped as grains of rice) heated in clarified butter. But no pounding (*avaghāta*, threshing) is to be done in this, as the grains being made of gold, there is no chaff which can be separated by pounding (X. I. 1-3). Similarly, no *upastaraṇa*[2188] (pouring of clarified butter) and *abhighāraṇa* (the subsequent pouring of clarified butter) are to be done, since in the model sacrifice these two are done for making the oblation to have a sweet flavour (X. 2. 3-11). A caru of rice has to be boiled (i. e. the heat of fire is to be applied to it). In the same way the golden pieces are to be heated in clarified butter by fire (X. 2. 1-2). The golden pieces have to be sucked like sugarcane pieces (X. 2. 13-16), because they cannot be eaten while in the

2186. बाधो नाम यदेवेदमिति निश्चितं विज्ञानं कारणान्तरेण मिथ्येति कल्प्यते। तथा, अभ्युच्चयो यदिदमिह भवतीति विज्ञातेऽपरमपि भवतीति विज्ञानम्। शबर on X. 1. 1; अपि वाऽभिधानसंस्कारद्रव्यमर्थे क्रियेत तादर्थ्यात्। पू. मी. सू. X. 1. 2; नैतदस्ति सर्वं प्राकृतं विकृतौ कर्तव्यमिति। क्वचिदभिधानसंस्कारद्रव्यं निवर्तितुमर्हति यद्लुप्तार्थम्। कुत एतत्। अभिधान-संस्कारद्रव्यं हि प्रयोजने सति क्रियते नाप्रयोजनम्। शबर.

2187. प्राजापत्यं घृते चरुं निर्वपेच्छतकृष्णलमायुष्कामः। मै. सं. II. 2. 2. न्याय. वि. p. 37 refers to the absence of threshing in the matter of कृष्णलs.

2188. For उपस्तरण and अभिघारण, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 528 n 1233.

model sacrifice *iḍā* and *prāśitra* [2189] are actually eaten. In a magic rite like *śyena* reeds are spread on the ground and not kuśa grass (as in the model sacrifice). This bādha is due to a special text. [2190] The general rule in vedic sacrifices is that priests have to be chosen and dakṣiṇā is to be paid to them at the end but sattras are an exception, since in sattras all are priests as well as performers (yajamānas). Here the exclusion of *varaṇa* (choosing) is due to the fact that in the other sacrifices the yajamāna and priests are different and the latter are engaged for fee. There is a visible purpose in selecting or engaging priests, [2191] but in a sattra where *ex hypothesi* all are yajamānas and priests as well, there is no visible purpose in going through the ceremony of choosing priests (ṛtvig-varaṇa).

One example of samuccaya may be given. In the Vājapeya (which is said to be a form of Jyotiṣṭoma according to PMS III, 7. 50-51) seventeen animals are to be sacrificed. In the model sacrifice (i e. Jyotiṣṭoma) also there are certain animals to be offered. The question is whether there is bādha of the *paśus* prescribed in the prakṛtiyāga or whether there is combination (samuccaya). The conclusion is that there is samuccaya (X. 4. 6), because in the Tai. Br. there occur passages like this—"The Brahmavādins say 'why is it that all sacrificial rites are contained in Vājapeya'? He should reply 'by means of paśus, viz. he sacrifices an animal to Agni, thereby he contains Agniṣṭoma, he contains the Ukthya &c." This shows that he has to sacrifice also other animals besides the seventeen. [2192] The Mit.

2189. For iḍā, vide vol. II p. 1065 n 2382 and for prāśitra, vol. II. p. 1039 n 2339. स्याद्वा निर्धानदर्शनात्। पू. मी. सू. X. 2. 14; स्याद्वा हिरण्यस्य भक्षः। भक्षणविशेषदर्शनात्। निरवधयन्तो भक्षयन्ति चुच्छुषाकारं भक्षयन्तीति। ग्रासे भक्षे केवलं भक्षोपायं विधास्यति शब्द इति। शबर; पूर्ववाक्ये कृष्णलानां प्राधान्यादाज्यस्य च तदङ्गत्वात् तेषामेव भक्षणवाक्येऽन्वयः। तेषां चानदनीयानामपि मद्यानवद्भक्षणमपि वचनाद्भविष्यतीति। तेषामेव चुच्छुषाकरणविशिष्टं भक्षणं विधीयते। शास्त्रदीपिका. चुच्छुषा is an onomatopoetic word for making a smacking sound when sucking juice.

2190. सोमारौद्रं चरुं निर्वपेत्कृष्णानां व्रीहीणामभिचरन् शरमयं बर्हिर्भवति वैभीदक इध्मः। शृणादिति शरमयं बर्हिर्भवति। मै. सं. II. 1. 6 and पू. मी. सू. X. 4. 1-2.

2191. वरणमृत्विजामानमनार्थत्वात्सत्रे न स्यात् स्वकर्मत्वात्। पू. मी. सू. X. 2. 34; वरणं ऋत्विजां सत्रेषु न स्यात्। न कर्तव्यमिति। स्वार्थं हि तेषां कर्म। न च कश्चिदात्मानं वृणीते। प्रकृतौ च आनमनार्थं वरणं दृष्टप्रयोजनमिति न शक्यमदृष्टं कल्पयितुम्। तस्मात्सत्रेषु वरणं न स्यात्। शबर. आनमन means 'submission or obedience to another's direction.'

2192. प्राजापत्येषु चाम्नानात्। पू. मी. सू. X. 4. 6; शबर quotes the passage 'ब्रह्मवादिनो वदन्ति ... एतावन्तो वै यज्ञक्रतवः, तान् पशुभिरेवावरुन्धे' (तै. ब्रा. I. 3. 4) and remarks 'इति समुच्चयं दर्शयति'.

on Yāj. III. 243 furnishes examples of *samuccaya* in the matter of expiations.

The Tantravārtika (on PMS III. 3. 14 pp. 859–860) collects together about three dozen cases of *bādha* in general not dependent on either the conflict between śruti, liṅga &c. or not falling under the bādha instanced above. They are 'inference and such appearances as mirage are dispelled by or invalidated by direct perception, deceptive means of knowledge by the six means of knowledge, smṛti by śruti, a contradictory and untrustworthy smṛti by a trustworthy and uncontradicted smṛti, a smṛti with a visible purpose by another with an unseen purpose &c.'.

There is in the 10th chapter an important topic about *dakṣiṇā* (sacrificial fees). In X. 2. 22–28 it is established that dakṣiṇā is to be given not for an unseen purpose (adṛṣṭa) but for engaging the priests to perform rites required in sacrifices. In III. 8 1–2 it is established that the yajamāna (the svāmin) is to engage priests for sacrifices except where a vedic text expressly directs otherwise (as in Tai. S. V. 2. 8. 2). In X. 3. 39 the items of *dakṣiṇā* are set out from Tāṇḍya XVI. 1. 10–11; it is held that the words 'dvādaśaśatam dakṣiṇā' mean[2193] that the cows are to be 112 (X. 3. 39, 49) and in X. 3. 50 it is provided that the yajamāna should himself distribute the fees and X. 3. 55 sets out the method of distribution. All priests are not to receive equal shares. The four principal priests are hotṛ, adhvaryu,[2194] udgātṛ and brahmā and each of these four have three assistants arranged in a certain order set out in the note below. Suppose there are one hundred cows to be distributed

---

2193. अस्ति ज्योतिष्टोमः, ज्योतिष्टोमेन स्वर्गकामो यजेतेति । तत्रैवमाम्नायते । गौश्चाश्वश्चाश्वतरश्च गर्दभश्चाजाश्चावयश्च व्रीहयश्च यवाश्च तिलाश्च माषाश्च । तस्य द्वादशशतं दक्षिणा । शबर on X. 3. 39. There is great divergence of views about the dakṣiṇā to be given; vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1188.

2194. होता मैत्रावरुणोऽच्छावाको ग्रावस्तुत्, अध्वर्युः प्रतिप्रस्थाता नेष्टोन्नेता, ब्रह्मा ब्राह्मणाच्छंसी आग्नीध्रः पोता, उद्गाता प्रस्तोता प्रतिहर्ता सुब्रह्मण्यः–इति ।. The four principal priests are underlined, three assistants come after each principal one. The assistants immediately after all four principals are called *ardhinaḥ* (they get half of their principal, they being मैत्रावरुण, प्रतिप्रस्थाता, ब्राह्मणाच्छंसिन् and प्रस्तोता), the thirds in each group of four constitute what are called *tṛtīyinaḥ* (they get ⅓ of what their principals get, they being अच्छावाकः, नेष्टा, आग्नीध्रः, प्रतिहर्ता), the last in each of the four groups are called pādinaḥ (they get one-fourth of what their principals get, they being ग्रावस्तुत्, उन्नेता, पोता and सुब्रह्मण्य). Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 1188–1189 and vol. III. p. 469 for distribution of fees among sacrificial priests.

as fee. Each group of four is assigned 1/4 i. e. 25 for *hotā* and his assistants, the *hotā* getting 12 and the other three getting respectively 6, 4, and 3 i. e. they get respectively half, 1/3 and 1/4 of what their principal gets. The same method applies to the other three groups. The prima facie[2195] view is that there should be an equal distribition of the fee (cows) as śruti does not lay down any unequal distribution; this is not accepted and it is proposed that the fee should be distributed in proportion to the work done by each. The established conclusion is that both the views are unacceptable and that the distribution should be in accordance with the meaning of the words 'ardhinaḥ,[2196] tṛtīyinaḥ and pādinaḥ' employed by Śruti.

Manu (VIII. 210) mentions the method of the distribution of fees in Vedic sacrifices outlined above and extends its principles of division to men working jointly on such undertakings as the construction of houses &c.[2197] Though the sūtra (samaṁ syād-aśrutivāt) is only the pūrvapakṣa view and not accepted as to the distribution of the cows as fees in Vedic sacrifices, it has been frequently followed as an equitable rule by medieval Dharmaśāstra writers. The Sm. C. relies on it about the liability of sureties (II. p. 152), about equal shares between father and sons in partition (II. p. 260) and II. 285 (distribution of *yautaka* among unmarried daughters), II. 404. Kullūka on Manu III. 1 (where 36 years are laid down as the period of studentship for mastering the three Vedas) states, relying on the sūtra 'samam' &c. that thirty-six years should be equally distributed over the three Vedaśākhās. The Madanaratna (on Vyavahāra) p. 202

2195. समं स्यादश्रुतित्वात्। अपि वा कर्मवैषम्यात्। अतुल्याः स्युः परिक्रये विषमाख्या विधिश्रुतौ परिक्रयान्न कर्मण्युपपद्यते दर्शनाद्विशेषस्य तथाभ्युदये। पू. मी. सू. X. 3. 53-55.

2196. अध्वर्युः गृहपतिं दीक्षयित्वा ब्रह्माणं दीक्षयति तत उद्गातारं ततो होतारम्। ततस्तं प्रतिप्रस्थाता दीक्षयित्वा अर्धिनो दीक्षयति।... ततस्तं नेष्टा दीक्षयित्वा तृतीयिनो दीक्षयति।... ततस्तमुन्नेता दीक्षयित्वा पादिनो दीक्षयति पोतारं ब्रह्मणः सुब्रह्मण्यमुद्गातुः ग्रावस्तुतं होतुः। शबर on V. 1. 1 and also on X. 3. 55. Vide आप. श्रौ. सू. XXI. 2. 16-20 for a similar passage.

2197. सर्वेषामर्धिनो मुख्यास्तदर्धेनार्धिनोऽपरे।... अनेन विधियोगेन कर्तव्यांशप्रकल्पना॥ मनु. VIII. 210-211; एतच्चांशपरिकल्पनविधानं तस्य द्वादशशतं दक्षिणेति क्रतुसम्बन्धमात्रेण विहितायां दक्षिणायां न तु ऋत्विग्विशेषसम्बन्धित्वेन विहितायाम्। [illegible] शब्दे इति तत्प्रतिपादकश्रुतिविरोधापत्तेः। मदनरत्न (व्यव०) pp. 202-203. मदनरत्न adds (p. 204) 'पशुबन्धादौ विषमविभागो नोक्त इति तत्र साम्येन दक्षिणाविभागः।'. If there be 112 cows, 28 cows are to be assigned to each of four वर्गs (viz. होतृवर्ग, अध्वर्युवर्ग, उद्गातृवर्ग and ब्रह्मवर्ग), then होतृवर्ग share is to be divided into 25 and होतृ is to get 12 out of 25 parts and his assistants 6, 4, 3 respectively i. e. the shares would approximately be 13, 6, 5, 4 (in 28 cows).

quotes both verses of Manu (VIII. 210–11), then quotes Manu VIII. 210 (on p. 213) and explains and then sets out the distribution of the dakṣiṇā if it was 112 cows. The Vyahāraprakāśa pp. 443 and 548 (on division of mother's yautaka strīdhana by unmarried daughters) refer to the rule of equal division. Most of these works (as printed) read the sūtra as 'samam syādaśrutatvāt' and not as Jaimini and Śabara read.

The eleventh chapter deals with *tantra* which embraces cases where one act serves the purpose of several other acts or rites.[2198] For example, there are three yāgas viz. puroḍāśa (cake) baked on eight potsherds for Agni, curds for Indra and milk for Indra; one performance of the Prayājas serves these three (XI. 1. 5–19 and XI. 1. 29–37). Ādhāna (establishment of the sacred fires) is to be done only once and is not to be repeated in each *iṣṭi*, paśuyāga or somayāga (XI. 3. 2); the utensils required for Śrauta rites are prepared only once and are to be kept till the death of the sacrificer (XI. 3. 34–42).[2199] All these are cases of *tantra*. The general rule is that the place, time and the performer as regards all principal matters in one composite rite such as Āgneya and others in Darśapūrṇamāsa are one (XI. 2. 1) and also that they are the same for aṅgas (details); but in the case of the aṅgas (details) the place, time and the performer may be different on account of express texts.

If the fruit or result (*phala*) follows from all the component sacrifices collectively, then the subsidiary details have to be

---

2198. यत्सकृत्कृतं बहूनामुपकरोति तत् तन्त्रमित्युच्यते यथा बहूनां ब्राह्मणानां मध्ये कृतः प्रदीपः। यत्त्वावृत्त्योपकरोति स आवापः। यथा तेषामेव ब्राह्मणानामनुलेपनम्। श्लोकमप्युदाहरन्ति-साधारणं भवेत्तन्त्रं परार्थे त्वप्रयोजकः। एवमेव प्रसङ्गः स्याद्विद्यमाने स्वके विधौ। शबर on XI. 1. 1; against repeating such acts as प्रयाजs, शबर remarks 'येन सकृत्कृतेन नोपकृतं स पुनः क्रियमाण उपकरिष्यतीति काशा।' on XI. 1. 30; even the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali mentions this rule; on वार्तिक 4 (तन्त्रावयवे शास्त्रार्थसंप्रत्ययो यथा लोके) on पा. VI. 1. 84 it remarks 'यथा लोके वसन्ते ब्राह्मणोऽग्नीनादधीतेति सकृदाधाय कृतः शास्त्रार्थ इति कृत्वा पुनः प्रवृत्तिर्न भवति। यथा गर्भाष्टमे ब्राह्मण उपनेय इति सकृदुपनीय कृतः शास्त्रार्थ इति कृत्वा पुनः प्रवृत्तिर्न भवति।'.

2199. यज्ञायुधानि धार्येरन् प्रतिपत्तिविधानादृजीषवत्। पू. मी. सू. XI. 3. 34. The Vedic text is आहिताग्निमग्निभिर्दहन्ति यज्ञपात्रैश्च. Ten यज्ञायुधs are enumerated in तै. सं. I. 6. 8. 2–3 (स्फ्यश्च कपालानि च etc.). For these and other utensils required in Vedic sacrifices, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 985, n. 2233; vide also पू. मी. सू. XI. 3. 43–45 which establish that the Yajñapātras are to be kept from the day of Agnyādheya and that placing them on the body of the sacrificer after his death is *pratipattikarma* of the utensils and of the sacred fires. Vide शबर on जै. XI. 3. 45.

performed only once and not separately in the case of each component; this is *tantra*. But if the result follows from each of the component sacrifices separately, then the subsidiary details should be performed with each one of those components. That would be a case of āvāpa (decentralisation or scattering). In the Darśapūrṇamāsa there are really two sets [2200] of sacrifices, one called Darśa (on amāvāsyā) and the other Pūrṇamāsa. The subsidiaries prescribed for each are almost the same. Yet they have to be repeated with each of the two sets, the principal reason being that the two are performed on two different days separated by a fortnight, though the two sets together make one single sacrifice leading to a single fruit. Vide PMS XI. 2. 12-18 which is a case of āvāpa.

The Aveṣṭi is a sacrifice which is performed as part of the composite sacrifice called Rājasūya that could be performed only by Kṣatriyas. It is also an independent sacrifice that could be performed by any one of the three higher varṇas. This is no part of the Rājasūya and is different from it, though the passage about it occurs in the midst of the description of Rājasūya.[2201] This is relied upon by the Nirṇayasindhu in connection with the Navarātra from Āśvina 1st to 9th of the bright half. There were different views, viz. Devīpūjā was to be performed for 9 days or on 8th or 9th tithi (vide above p. 154). The Kālikāpurāṇa quotes [2202] a verse about Devīpūjā on the 8th or 9th alone of Āśvina (*śukla*) and the N. S. interprets it as a separate worship on 8th or 9th alone distinct from the whole Navarātra.

2200. On XI. 2.15 शबर says 'अपि वा न तन्त्रमङ्गानि स्युः । कुतः कर्मपृथक्त्वात् । तेषां च तन्त्रविधानात् । कर्माणि तावदेतानि भिन्नानि अन्यः पौर्णमासः समुदायोऽन्य आमावास्यः । एवं सर्वत्र । तेषां च देशकालभेदः । पौर्णमास्यां पौर्णमास्या यजेतेत्येवमादिः साङ्गानां च तेषां तत्र तत्र देशकालविधिः । ... तस्मात्पौर्णमास्यङ्गानां पौर्णमासीकालः । अमावास्याङ्गानाममावास्याकालः । तत्र गृह्यते विशेषः । विशेषग्रहणाद्भेदः । '.

2201. अवेष्टौ यज्ञसंयोगात्क्रतुप्रधानमुच्यते । पू. मी. सू. II. 3. 3; अस्ति राजसूयः, राजा राजसूयेन यजेतेति । तं प्रकृत्यामनन्ति—अवेष्टिं नामेष्टिम् । आग्नेयोऽष्टाकपालो हिरण्यं दक्षिणा इत्येवमादि । तां प्रकृत्य विधीयते । यदि ब्राह्मणो यजेत बार्हस्पत्यं मध्ये निधायाहुतिमाहुतिं हुत्वाभिघारयेत् । यदि राजन्य ऐन्द्रं यदि वैश्यो वैश्वदेवम्-इति । शबर; for यदि ब्राह्मणो ... वैश्वदेवम् vide आप. श्रौ. 18. 21. 11. The सूत्र 'अवेष्टौ यज्ञसंयोगात्' may be expanded as follows 'अवेष्टौ यदि ब्राह्मण इत्यादिकं ब्राह्मणादिकर्तृकप्रयोगान्तरप्रधानं स्यादेकस्यैव क्षत्रियस्य राजसूययज्ञसंयोगात्; then come अवेष्टौ चैकतन्त्र्यं स्याल्लिङ्गदर्शनात् । वचनात्कामसंयोगेन । क्रत्वर्थायामिति चेन्न वर्णसंयोगात् । पू. मी. सू. XI. 4. 8-10.

2202. एकाहपक्षोऽपि कालिकापुराणे-यस्त्वेकस्यामथाष्टम्यां नवम्यामथ साधकः । पूजयेद्वरदां देवीं महाविभवविस्तरैः ॥ इति । तस्य तु राजसूयेष्ट्ययागैः समप्रधानायाः सहितायाः अप्यवेष्टेरेतयाऽन्नाद्यकामं याजयेदित्येकत्वान्मध्ये विधानाद्य यथा फलार्थो बहिः प्रयोगस्तथा नवरात्रमध्यस्थाया अष्टम्या नवम्या वा फलार्थः पृथक्प्रयोगः । नि. सि. *p.* 164.

The same *adhikaraṇa* where the Pūrvapakṣa proposes that Rājā means any one of any varṇa who rules over a kingdom and offers protection to the country and its cities, the siddhānta (PMS and Śabara) holds that 'rājā' is a word expressive of a caste viz. Kṣatriya, and this is referred to by several late Dharmaśāstra works like the Rājadharmakaustubha (p. 5). The V. P. refers to this adhikaraṇa and interprets the verse of Nārada viz. 'one who is an apostate from the order of ascetics would become the slave of the king' as providing that even a kṣatriya apostate would have to be the slave even of a vaiśya ruler, though the word 'rājā' in the primary sense means a kṣatriya yet in a secondary sense (lakṣaṇā) any one who protects subjets could be called rājā. The Par. M. discusses this adhikaraṇa at great length (I. 1. pp. 449–55). It may be noticed that the meaning of 'rājā' as kṣatriya in early texts changed to any ruler of any class who protects the country and people ruled over by him. This change is brought out briefly in Tantravārtika on III. 5. 26.

The 12th chapter deals with the topics of *prasaṅga*, *vikalpa* and the like. Prasaṅga occurs when something done in one place is helpful in another place also, just as when a lamp is lighted in a mansion it illumines the public road also.[2203] In connection with the Agnīṣomīya animal sacrifice an offering of *paśupuroḍāśa* (a cake of the meat of the animal sacrificed) in the words 'having offered the omentum of the animal to Agni and Soma one offers a paśupuroḍāśa cooked on eleven potsherds to Agni and Soma'. The question is whether the details such as *prayājas* should be performed afresh for this or whether those details performed at the time of offering the omentum will suffice. The established conclusion is that the details already performed at offering paśu (omentum) will serve for the offering of the meat cake also.[2204] In such cases the place or time and performer are to be the same. This conclusion is relied upon in the Prāyaścittaviveka which says that when a man performs the expiation for twelve years in connection with grave sins of

---

2203. अन्यत्र कृतस्यान्यत्रापि प्रसक्तिः प्रसङ्गः। यथा प्रदीपस्य प्रासादे कृतस्य राजमार्गेऽप्यालोककरणम्। शबर on पू. मी. XII. 1. 1.

2204. अग्नीषोमीये पशौ पुरोडाशः, अग्नीषोमीयस्य वपया प्रचर्याग्नीषोमीयं पशुपुरोडाशमेकादशकपालं निर्वपेदिति। किं तस्य पृथक्त्वेनाङ्गानि कर्तव्यानि उत यानि पशौ कृतानि तस्याप्युपकुर्वन्तीति। शबर on XII. 1. 1; अथवा नैव भेदेन पुरोडाशस्य तन्त्रं कर्तव्यम्। किं तर्हि। मुख्यतन्त्रेण सिद्धिः स्यात्। पाशुकमेव तन्त्रं पुरोडाशस्योपकुर्यात्। किं कारणम्। तन्त्रमध्ये विधानात्। पाशुकस्य तन्त्रस्य मध्ये पुरोडाशो विहितः, अग्नीषोमीयस्य वपया ... कपालं निर्वपतीति। शबर on XII. 1. 3.

different kinds or of the same kind, there is no necessity of a separate expiation for venial sins on the analogy of paśupuroḍāśa.[2205] Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 88–91 for twelve years' expiation for brāhmaṇa-murder.

Vikalpa has already been dealt with above (pp. 1249–1252).

The preceding pages are enough to exhibit the main doctrines and some of the principal Mīmāṁsā rules of interpretation and the great influence that the Mīmāṁsā exercised for over two thousand years on Dharmaśāstra works from the Āpastambadharmasūtra to late medieval works like the Smṛtitattva, Nirṇayasindhu and Vyavahāramayūkha. An exhaustive treatment of the numerous technical terms, topics and principles of the mīmāṁsā would easily cover a thousand pages, would enormously add to the extent of this work and has to be given up here for reasons of space, if for no other reason.

The Mīmāṁsā rules have been of considerable help to Dharmaśāstra writers. But it should not be supposed that application of the Mīmāṁsā rules is easy or that the rules always enable scholars to arrive at agreed or certain and definite conclusions. Apart from the schism between the Prābhākara and Bhāṭṭa schools already referred to above (on p. 1189) there are many circumstances which militate against the certainty and usefulness of mīmāṁsā conclusions. There are variant readings in the sūtras themselves (e. g. on I. 2. 9 there are three readings according to Tantravārtika p. 123, on I. 2. 14 two readings acc. to Tantrav. pp. 128–129). Śabara omitted the sutra II. 4. 17 (vākyāsamavāyāt) and the Tantravārtika notes (pp. 895–897) that Śabara omits six sūtras after III. 4. 9. Śabara frequently mentions a predecessor called Vṛttikāra with great respect but differs from him in some cases (e. g. on I. 1. 3–5), does not like his way of dealing with sūtras like II. 1. 32, 33 and VIII. 1. 2. Śabara gives alternative explanations of the same sūtra (e. g. of I. 3. 4, VII. 4. 13, VIII. 1. 39). Sometimes he treats two or more sūtras as forming one *adhikaraṇa* and alternatively treats one of them as forming a separate adhikaraṇa (as in I. 3. 3–4, II. 2. 23–24). He proposes more than two explanations of the same sūtra viz. IV. 1. 2. He puts forward two or more explanations of the same *adhikaraṇa* (as in IV. 3. 27–28, VIII. 3. 14–15

2205. एवमतुल्यरूपेषु पापेषु समानजातीयेषु विजातीयेषु वा गुरुपापोद्देशेन द्वादशवार्षिकादिरूपप्रायश्चित्ते कृते स्वल्पपापानां पशुपुरोडाशन्यायेन प्रसङ्गादेव कार्यसिद्धेर्लाघवात् न पृथक् प्रायश्चित्तानुष्ठानम्। प्राय. वि. p. 85.

of two sūtras out of four), IX. 1. 1, IX. 1. 2–3, IX. 1. 34–35, IX. 2. 1–2, IX. 2. 21–24, IX. 2. 25–28 four explanations, X. 2. 30–31 three explanations, X. 1. 1–2 three explanations, X. 4. 1–2 three explanations. On 'Viśaye prāyadarśanāt' II. 3. 16 Śabara himself is at a loss as to what the doubt intended by the sūtrakāra is or what the sūtrakāra wants to establish and relies upon what the vṛttikāra says about the passage to be discussed and about the doubt that arises. Besides, Śabara and Kumārila differ about the subject matters of certain *adhikaraṇas* as in 1. 3. 3–4 (where Kumārila gives on pp. 194–195 a different interpretation altogether after first accepting Śabara's view), 1. 3. 5–7, I. 3. 8–9, I. 3. 11–14. Kumārila shows scant respect for Jaimini by naming him without the honorific title 'bhagavān' or 'ācārya' on pp. 495, 650, 655, 895, charges Jaimini with composing sūtras not containing much substance (p. 895) and remarks that Jaimini's sūtra is improper or wrong (e. g. vide p. 1241 about IV. 2. 27).

Kumārila is often critical of Śabara's bhāṣya and remarks dozens of times that the bhāṣya is improper (*ayukta*) or deserves to be discarded, is unmeaning or absurd (*asambaddha*) as on pp. 165, 302 (*upekṣitavya*), 313 (*asambaddha*), 314, 662, 710, 731, 863 (*asambaddha*), 950, 953, 1090–91, 1615 (*bahavo doṣāḥ*), 1714, 1980, 2004, 2193, 2204.

Another circumstance that makes one entertain grave doubts about the universal validity and usefulness of the principles evolved by the PMS system must also be adverted to. The greatest students of Mīmāṁsā arrive at entirely different conclusions on many points. Some striking cases may be referred to here. One of the most glaring of such cases is the interpretation of the short sūtra of Vasiṣṭha[2206] (15. 5, na strī putram dadyāt pratigṛhṇīyād vā anyatrānujñādbhartuḥ) 'a woman should not give or take a son in adoption except with the assent of her husband.' This has been interpreted in four different ways by works and authors about a Hindu widow's power of adopting a son. The Dattakamīmāṁsā holds that no widow can adopt a son, because, the husband being already dead, no assent of his can be had at the time of adoption. Vācaspati,

2206. अत एव वसिष्ठः । न स्त्री पुत्रं ... भर्तुः—इति । अनेन विधवाया भर्त्रनुज्ञानासम्भवादनधिकारो गम्यते । ... किं च व्याहृतिभिर्हुत्वा अदूरबान्धवं संनिकृष्टमेव प्रतिगृह्णीयात्—इति समानकर्तृकताबोधक-क्त्वाप्रत्ययश्रवणात् होमकर्तुरेव प्रतिग्रहसिद्धेः स्त्रीणां होमानधिकारत्वात् परिग्रहानधिकारः—इति वाचस्पतिः । दत्तकमीमांसा pp. 19 and 22–23 (Ānan).

a Maithila writer, was of the same opinion on the further ground that, as Vasiṣṭha lays down that one about to take a son in adoption should, after having performed a *homa* in the middle of his house with the vyāhṛtis, take (in adoption) only him who is closely related and who is a kinsman and not remote (in habitation &c.) and, as women cannot perform a homa with Vedic mantras, all women including widows have no power to adopt. But in Bengal, it was held that the husband's assent need not be given at the time of adoption and that it may be given long before the actual adoption. In Madras it was held that the word husband in 'except with the assent of the husband' is only illustrative and that therefore the assent of the agnates of the father-in-law (husband's father) or of the husband's agnates would be enough to enable a widow to adopt. The Vyavahāramayūkha,[2207] the Nirṇayasindhu and the Saṁskāra-kaustubha hold that the assent of the husband is required for a woman whose husband is living and that a widow can adopt provided she has not been forbidden to adopt by her husband. For a detailed presentation of these four views and the case law, vide H. of Dh. vol. III, pp. 668–674. The Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act (No. 78 of 1956) has made far-reaching and radical changes in the Law of Hindu adoptions and section 4 of that Act overrules all texts, rules or interpretations of Hindu Law or customs and usages as part of that law, except in so far as they may have been expressly saved by that Act.

The Mitākṣarā and the Dāyabhāga, both steeped in Mīmāṁsā lore, differ on numerous points, some of which are :— (1) The Mit. holds that property or ownership arises by birth, the Dāyabhāga denies it and says it is on the death of the previous owner or by partition; (2) superior right to inherit depends on religious efficacy according to the Dāyabhāga, while nearness of blood relation is the determining factor according to the Mit.; (3) Members of a joint family hold family property in quasi-severalty and can dispose of their shares even before partition according to the Dāyabhāga; the Mit. does not say so; (4) acc. to Dāyabhāga even in a joint family a widow succeeds to her husband's share on his death without male issue, while the Mit. does not accept this view.

2207. भर्त्रनुज्ञा तु सधवाया एव दृष्टार्थत्वात्। विधवायास्तु तां विनापि पितुस्तदभावे ज्ञातीनामाज्ञया भवति ... अतो यस्यामवस्थायां भर्त्रनुज्ञा प्राप्ता सैवात्रानूद्यते न त्वपूर्वा विधीयते। अतो विधवाया भर्तुराज्ञां विनाप्यधिकारः। व्य. म. p. 113; उक्तविधदत्तकस्वीकारः पुंभिरिव स्त्रीभिरपि सधवाभिर्विधवाभिश्च कार्यः। सं. कौ. p. 160.

One may note the great cleavage of opinion (above p. 1230) on such texts as Yāj. I. 81 (whether there is a vidhi or a niyama or parisaṅkhyā); in note 2111 (p. 1291) between the V. M. and Raghunandana both great Mimāṁsakas; in note 2113 p. 1292 on the interpretation of the word 'mātr' by Aparārka and the Dāyabhāga; on pp. 1302–3, notes 2133–34 above on Bṛhaspati's verse on re-united coparceners.

In passing it may be stated that to call the Act 'Hindu Adoptions Act' is a travesty and misnomer. It should have simply been called the Law of Adoptions in India and should have retained the ancient Hindu rules for Hindus as developed by the courts and should have been of a permissive character for all Indians like the English Statute (of 1926) on the adoption of children. The general Hindu law of adoption as developed in the authoritative smrtis and commentaries and the case law did not contemplate the adoption of a daughter (except when she was made in ancient times a *putrikā*) and to allow the adoption of a daughter when a son was living throws to the winds the basic priniciple of the Hindu Law that a *sonless* man should adopt a male as a son for the sake of the presentation of piṇḍas and water (to the Manes) and for continuance of the family name (sections 7 and 11 of the Act). The Act allows a woman (even if not married) to adopt to herself a son or daughter or both and under it a woman, if married, can adopt a daughter even if she has a son but a married woman cannot adopt a daughter if she has already a daughter or a son's daughter living at the time of adoption (sections 8 and 11). The Act does not recognize dvyāmusyāyana adoptions which were recognized by Sanskrit texts and also by judicial decisions. The ministers in the Government and their followers (most of the latter hardly know what Hindu Law was and has been) were carried away by enthusiasm for equality of rights for both men and women. As the Indian Union is now a welfare State and it is professed that laws are to be made keeping in view a socialistic pattern, Govt. should have disallowed adoptions altogether or at least put great curbs on indiscriminate adoptions. Instead, they extended the scope of adoption among Hindus by allowing a man to adopt a daughter even when he had a son or sons and by allowing even unmarried women to adopt a son or daughter or both. This is against a socialistic pattern. If adoptions had been disallowed entirely or allowed within narrow limits cases of escheat to Government for want of heirs would have been many and to that

extent a socialistic pattern would have been advanced. There is no evidence to show that women were keen on the right to adopt a son or daughter even when they were unmarried. The first principle of introducing reforms in the existing law is that only strictly necessary changes should be put forward. Reformers and legislators should take to heart the advice of Mr. Aldous Huxley (in 'Ends and Means,' p. 30) that change as such is more or less distressing to most human beings, that man's conservatism is a fact in any historical situation and that social reformers should abstain from making unnecessary changes or changes that are of startling magnitude. Legislators should not forget that when they introduce far-reaching changes to lessen hardships, real or supposed, deemed to be caused by existing social conditions, they very often create new problems for the immediate future. To take a simple example, under the old Hindu Law all girls were to be married before puberty, though Manu (IX. 90) provided that a girl should wait for three years thereafter during which, her parents or relatives might select a bridegroom for her, but that if they failed to do so she may herself choose her partner. This was not a bad provision. People however went in for child marriages for girls and the problem of spinsters never arose. Then over thirty years ago came the Child Marriage Restraint Act (XIX of 1929) whereby the legally allowed marriageable age for girls was fixed at 14. By subsequent amendments and by the Hindu Marriage Act (25 of 1955) the lowest marriageable age for girls is now fixed at 15. This Act of 1929 originally went a long way in raising the minimum age for the marriage of girls. Then, after the second world war, owing to economic stringency, and other factors, the tendency of marrying at a late age increased and now the problem of spinsters among Hindus has emerged and great difficulties about the marriages of grown-up women in middle class families are being experienced.

Appendix to Section VII Chap. XXX.

It would be helpful to the students of Pūrvamīmāṁsā and of Dharmaśāstra, if some of the important and frequently cited maxims (nyāyas) of the former, are brought together in one place with references from the P. M. S., Śabara, Kumārila, Pārthasārathi, the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, Śaṅkarācārya's bhāṣya on the Vedānta-sūtras, the Bhāmatī on the Śāṅkarabhāṣya and a few others. Kumārila, particularly, is very fond of employing Nyāyas in the Tantravārtika e. g. on p. 415 (on Jai. II. 1. 8) he employs five different nyāyas. Many of these nyāyas have been explained in the several volumes of the History of Dharmaśāstra to which references will be furnished at the appropriate places. Several of the nyāyas here mentioned occur in the Laukika-nyāyāñjali (in three parts) published by the indefatigable scholar, Col. Jacob. In some cases his explanations are not accurate or satisfactory, but one must not forget that he wrote about half a century ago.

अग्निहोत्रन्याय — जै. VI. 2. 23–26; vide शङ्कर on वे. सू. III. 4. 32.

अङ्गगुणविरोधन्याय — जै. XII. 2. 25; vide शबर thereon and मी. न्या. प्र. p. 166.

अङ्गभूयस्त्वे फलभूयस्त्वम् — शबर on जै. X. 6. 62 and XI. 1. 15.

अङ्गाङ्गिन्याय — जै. II. 2. 3–8. Vide above p. 1308 n 2146.

अङ्गानां प्रधानोपकाररूपैककार्यार्थत्वम् — जै. XI. 1. 5–10.

अणुरपि विशेषोऽध्यवसायकरः — vide व्य. प्र. p. 525 and व्य. म. p. 143.

अधिकारन्याय — जै. VI. 1. 1–3 and 4–5 (śāstra is meant only for human beings), but vide वे. सू. I. 3. 26–33, where शङ्कर on I. 3. 26 holds that Śabara's words have no application to brahmavidyā.

अनन्यलभ्यः शब्दार्थः — मी. न्या. प्र. p. 92 'अत्राहुः। स एव शब्दस्यार्थो यः प्रकारान्तरेण न लभ्यते। अनन्य...र्थ इति न्यायात्।'; vide भामती on वे. सू. I. 3. 17 (प्रसिद्धेश्च).

अनुषङ्गन्याय — जै. II. 1. 48; vide pp. 1304–1306 above and स्मृतिच. (on श्राद्ध p. 381), व्य. म. p. 147.

अन्तरङ्गबहिरङ्गयोरन्तरङ्गं बलीयः — vide शबर on जै. XII. 2. 27; महाभाष्य (on पा. I. 1. 4, I. 1. 5) says 'असिद्धं बहिरङ्गमन्तरङ्गे'.

अन्धपरम्परान्याय — तन्त्रवा. on जै. I. 3. 27 p. 282 and on III. 3. 14 p. 858, मेधा. on मनु X. 5, शङ्कर on वे. सू. II. 2. 30.

अन्याय्यश्चानेकार्थत्वम् — शबर on जै. II. 1. 12 p. 410, on V. 4. 14 p. 1340, on VI. 1. 22 p. 1366, on VII. 3. 3, p. 1550; तन्त्रवा. on II. 4. 10, p. 639, भामती on वे. सू. I. 3. 17; vide मह. पा. p. 369 and p. 1292, n. 2112 above.

अपच्छेदन्याय — शबर on जै. VI. 5. 49–50 defines अपच्छेद as 'संयुक्तस्य हि पृथग्भावोऽपच्छेदः' and व्यव. म. p. 535. The word occurs in जै. VI. 5. 56.

अप्राप्ते शास्त्रमर्थवत् — This is part of जै. VI. 2. 18 and means 'विधिना तावत्तदेव विधेयं यत्प्रकारान्तरेणाप्राप्तम्' मी. न्या. प्र. p. 222.

अभिमर्शनन्याय — जै. III. 7. 8–10; व्यव. प्र. p. 535.

अभ्यासाधिकरण— जै. II. 2. 2 (with reference to five Prayājas in तै. सं. II. 6. 1. 1-2). Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1057 n 2368 and above p. 1306.

अभ्युदितेष्टिन्याय— जै. VI. 5. 1-9; मिता० on या. III. 253 and व्य. म. pp. 151-152 and notes thereon pp. 277-279 and भामती on वे. सू. III. 3. 7.

अरुणान्याय or अरुणाधिकरण — जै. III. 1. 12 on तै. सं. VI. 1. 6. 7 अरुणया पिङ्गाक्ष्या क्रीणाति; vide अपरार्क p. 1030 on या. III. 205, मद. पा. pp. 88-89, H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1142 n 2547 and above pp. 1294-5.

अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेत्—शबर on जै. I. 2. 4 quotes the latter half also as इष्टस्यार्थस्य संसिद्धौ को विद्वान् यत्नमाचरेत्. He explains अर्क as a plant (*Calatropis Gigantea*); vide also तन्त्रवा. on same p. 111, विश्वरूप on या. III. 243 (first half); शङ्कर on वे. सू. III. 4. 3 quotes the first half as a न्याय.

अर्धकुक्कुटीपाक — means the same thing as अर्धजरतीय; vide तन्त्रवा० p. 720 on जै. III. 1. 13. It means 'it involves a total contradiction to say that one would cook half a hen for food and keep the other half for laying eggs.'

अर्धजरतीय — Vide महाभाष्य on वार्तिक 5 on पा. IV. 1. 78 (अर्धं जरत्याः कामयतेऽर्धं नेति), शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. I. 2. 8 (यथाशास्त्रं तर्हि शास्त्रीयोऽर्थः प्रतिपत्तव्यो न तत्रार्धजरतीयं लभ्यम्), परा. मा. II. 1. p. 702.

अर्धवैशस — Resembles अर्धजरतीयन्याय. Vide तन्त्रवा. pp. 170, 174, 180, 261; शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. III. 3. 18. वैशस means 'destruction, rending into pieces, conflict'. The कुमारसम्भव IV. 31 employs the word in the literal sense.

अर्धमन्तर्वेदि मिनोत्यर्धं बहिर्वेदि— Vide शबर on जै. III. 7. 14 and तन्त्रवा. pp. 1083-84; quoted by व्य. म. pp. 115, 146 and notes (by the present author) pp. 189-191 and H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1114 and vol. III. pp. 694-95.

अवयवप्रसिद्धेः समुदायप्रसिद्धिर्बलीयसी — vide शबर on जै. VI. 7. 22, who gives अश्वकर्ण (name of a tree) with leaves like horse's ears as an instance (which has neither अश्वत्व nor कर्णत्व), तन्त्रवा. on जै. I. 4. 11.

अवेष्टयधिकरणन्याय— जै II. 3. 3 and XI. 4. 10. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 38 and above pp. 1332-33 n 2201-2, शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. III. 3. 50.

अश्वाभिधानीन्याय — इमामगृभ्णन्रशनामृतस्येत्यश्वाभिधानीमादत्ते—तै. सं. V. 1. 2. 1 and the mantra occurs in तै. सं. IV. 1. 2. 1, explained in मी. न्या. प्र. p. 80, अर्थसंग्रह p. 5. Vide p. 1308 n 2147.

अश्वकर्णन्याय—vide टुप्टीका on जै. IV. 4. 1 p. 1270. This is put forward to assert that in राजसूय the conventional meaning has to be taken and not the literal one.

आकाशमुष्टिहननन्याय—vide तन्त्रवा. on जै. I. 3. 12 p. 236 (यस्तन्तूनकुपादाय तुरीमात्रपरिग्रहात्। पटं कर्तुं समीहेत स हन्याद् व्योम मुष्टिभिः), शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 18.

आख्यातानामर्थं ब्रुवतां शक्तिः सहकारिणी—शबर on जै. I. 4. 25, अर्थसंग्रह (p. 16, calls it a न्याय), श्लोकवा. (on चोदनासूत्र verse 47 p. 59), तन्त्रवा. on जै. II. 1. 1 p. 378 (शक्तयः सर्वभावानां नानुयोज्याः स्वभावतः। तेन नाना बदन्त्यर्थान् प्रकृतिप्रत्ययादयः॥). Vide p. 1291 note 2111 above.

आमन्त्रणामन्त्रे निवेशः — Vide शबर on जै. V. 3. 4 and X. 5. 1, शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. IV. 3. 3, H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 731 notes 1413–14 and तिथितत्त्व p. 63, व्य. म. p. 143.

आनन्तर्यमकारणम् — Vide यस्य येनार्थसम्बन्धः below. Vide the sūtra आनन्तर्यमचोदना (जै. III. 1. 24) and जै. IV. 3. 11 a part of which is 'अर्थतो ह्यसमर्थानामानन्तर्येऽप्यसम्बन्धः'.

आर्त्यधिकरणन्याय — जै. VI. 4. 22; तै. ब्रा. III. 7. 1. 7–8 has यस्योभयं हविरार्तिमार्च्छेदैन्द्रं पञ्चशरावमोदनं निर्वपेत्. Here the word उभयं is अविवक्षित and is no part of the विधि.

उद्दिश्यमानस्य (or उद्देश्यगतं) विशेषणमविवक्षितम् — Vide above p. 1286 notes 2098–99 on ग्रहं संमार्ष्टि and टुप्टीका on जै. VI. 4. 22 p. 1438, on VII. 1. 2 p. 1526, on IX. 1. 1 p. 1636, on X. 3, 39 p. 1882 (उद्दिश्यमानस्य च संख्या न विवक्ष्यते ग्रहस्येव) and व्य. म. pp. 45–46, 90, 132, 210 and विश्वरूप on या. III. 250 (न च लक्ष्यमाणस्य विशेषणं विवक्षितमिति न्यायः).

उद्भिदधिकरण — जै. I. 4. 1–2. उद्भिद्, चित्रा, अग्निहोत्र are names of *yāgas* (and not गुणविधि) and are प्रमाण. Vide pp. 1244–45 n 2021–22 above.

उपक्रमोपसंहारन्याय — If the उपक्रम is doubtful it is the उपसंहार that settles the same and not *vice versa*. Vide भामती on वे. सू. III. 3. 17.

उपसंहारन्याय — जै. III. 1. 26–27; उपसंहारो नाम सामान्यतः प्राप्तस्य विशेषे सङ्कोचरूपो व्यापारविशेषो विधेः। मी. न्या. प्र. p. 261; vide मिता. on या. I. 256, नि. सि. pp. 37 and 71, व्य. म. p. 111 and the present author's notes to V. M. p. 179.

ऋतुलिङ्गन्याय — This refers to the verse यथर्तावृतुलिङ्गानि नानारूपाणि पर्यये। दृश्यन्ते तानि तान्येव यथा भावा युगादिषु॥ आदिपर्व 1. 39 (= cr. ed. 1. 37), शान्तिपर्व 210. 17 (= cr. ed. 233. 15). This verse is quoted by तन्त्रवा. on जै. I. 3. 7 p. 202, in शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. I. 3. 30. It is also वायुपुराण 9. 65, विष्णुपुराण I. 5. 61, मार्कण्डेय 45. 43–44.

एकवाक्यतान्याय — जै. II. 1. 46. Vide M. M. Jha's 'Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its sources' pp. 192–193 for explanation and examples and H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 443 note 744 and pp. 1297–98 n 2123 above. विश्वरूप on या. III. 248 exemplifies this न्याय. The word एकवाक्यता occurs in वे. सू. III. 4. 24.

एकहायनीन्याय — m. by तन्त्रवा. on II. 1. 12 p. 415. It is the same as अरुणान्याय above.

एकार्थास्तु विकल्पेरन् — This is part of जै. XII. 3. 10. मिता. on या. III. 257 states 'एकार्थानामेव विकल्पो व्रीहियवयोरिव न च कृच्छ्रतपसोरेकार्थत्वम्'.

ऐन्द्रीन्याय — Vide pp. 1309–10 notes 1251–52 on ऐन्द्र्या गार्हपत्यमुपतिष्ठते.

औदमेघिन्याय — If a man's name is औदमेघि one at once infers, without being expressly told, that he is the son of one called उदमेघ. Vide शबर on जै. III. 5. 26 p. 1003 and on II. 3, 3 at p. 580 and तन्त्रवा. p. 580.

औदुम्बराधिकरण — जै. I. 2. 19–25 concerning तै. सं. II. 1. 1. 6 औदुम्बरो यूपो भवति, ऊर्ग्वा उदुम्बर ऊर्क् पशवः, तन्त्रवा. p. 352, मी. न्या. प्र. p. 134 ff.

कपालन्याय or कपालाधिकरणन्याय — जै. X. 5. 1, explained in मलमासतत्त्व p. 779.

कपिञ्जलन्याय — जै. XI. 1. 38-46 and above pp. 1288–89, n 2105. Vide तन्त्रवा. p. 415 (on जै. II. 1. 12), and p. 1004 (on जै. III. 5. 26) saying कपिञ्जलवच्च त्रिष्वेव बहुत्वश्रुतिरवस्थाप्यते ; परा. मा. I. 2. p. 281.

कम्बलनिर्णेजनन्याय — शबर on जै. II. 2. 25 p. 545 (निर्णेजनं शुभ्रं करोति कम्बलशुद्धिं पादयोश्च निर्मलताम्).

कर्मभूयस्त्वात्फलभूयस्त्वम् — Vide स्मृतिच. II. p. 264 and परा. मा. I. 1. p. 25 (कर्माधिक्यात्फलाधिक्यमिति न्यायसमाश्रयात्).

कलञ्जन्याय — शबर on जै. VI. 2. 19–20 on 'न कलञ्जं भक्षयितव्यं' says that this is downright prohibition (प्रतिषेध) and not a पर्युदास. Vide मी. न्या. प्र. pp. 248–249 and तिथितत्त्व p. 6.

कांस्यभोजिन्याय — This occurs in the पू. मी. सू. XII. 2. 34 itself (अधिकश्च गुणः साधारणेऽविरोधात्कांस्यभोजिवदमुख्येऽपि); शबर explains 'शिष्यस्य कांस्यपात्रभोजित्वनियमः, उपाध्यायस्य न नियमः। यदि तयोरेकस्मिन्पात्रे भोजनमापद्यते, अमुख्यस्यापि शिष्यस्य धर्मो नियम्येत मा भूद्धर्मलोप इति।'.

काकदन्तपरीक्षान्याय — Vide टुप्टीका p. 1388 on जै. VI. 2. 1. Some actions such as counting the hair on the skin of an ass or the teeth of a crow are useless or profitless.

काकाक्षिगोलकन्याय — Vide तन्त्रवा. p. 198 on जै I. 3. 7, मेधा. on मनु VIII. 1, व्य. प्र. p. 534, व्य. म. p. 95 and notes thereon at p. 135.

काण्डानुसमय — शबर on जै. V. 2. 3 pp. 1310–11. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II, pp. 739–740, vol. IV. pp. 441–442 note 987 and पदार्थानुसमय below.

कारणानुविधायिकार्यन्याय — तन्त्रवा. p. 245 on जै. I. 3. 16. The qualities of the cause are found in the effect.

कुण्डपायिनामयनन्याय — जै. VII. 3. 1–4. Vide आप. श्रौ. 23. 10. 6 ff and H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 136–137 n 312 for references and p. 1307 above.

कुशकाशावलम्बनन्याय — Vide तन्त्रवा. p. 268 on जै. I. 3. 24. (कुश is दर्भ and काश is a grassy plant with white flowers). These are so frail that no one can support himself by means of these; so metaphorically it means "supporting by frail or hopeless arguments." Vide व्यव. प्र. p. 527.

कृत्वाचिन्तान्याय — Taking up a purely hypothetical point for discussion; occurs frequently in Śābarabhāṣya, e. g. on जै. VI. 8. 43 p. 1522 (कृत्वाचिन्तायां प्रयोजनं वक्तव्यम्), on XI. 3. 16 p. 2175, XII. 2. 11 p. 2242; vide तन्त्रवा. p. 287 (on जै. I. 3. 27) and p 890 on जै. III. 4. 1 (यत्तु भाष्यकारेणोपन्यासः कृतः स कृत्वाचिन्तान्यायेन).

कैमुतिकन्याय — The word is derived from किमुत, used in such passages as in कादम्बरी 'गर्भेश्वरत्व... शक्तित्वं चेति महतीयं खल्वनर्थपरम्परा, सर्वाविनयानामेकैकमप्येषामायतनं किमुत समवायः'। Vide व्य. म. p. 241 and present author's note on p. 419 of the notes to व्य. म.

क्षामेष्टिन्याय — जै. VI. 4. 17–20. If the Puroḍāśa to be offered in दर्शपूर्णमास is partially burnt, still one should perform the rite with the unburnt part of the cake and a prāyaścitta would be necessary only if the whole puroḍāśa is burnt. Vide मिताक्षरा on या. III. 243.

खलेकपोतवत् — Meaning 'like all pigeons, young and old, simultaneously alighting on a threshing floor.' Vide शबर on जै. XI. 1. 16 p 2111, मी. न्या. प्र. p. 65.

गार्हपत्यन्याय — Same as ऐन्द्रीन्याय above. Vide शबर on जै. III. 2. 3 and अर्थसंग्रह p. 6.

गुणकामाधिकरण — जै. II. 2. 25–26 based on दध्नेन्द्रियकामस्य जुहुयात् (तै. ब्रा. II. 1. 5. 6), the meaning being दधिकरणत्वेनेन्द्रियं भावयेत्. Vide मी. न्या. प्र. pp. 42–43, and 36–39 and p. 1310 above.

गुणमुख्यव्यतिक्रमन्याय — This is part of जै. III. 3. 9 (गुणमुख्यव्यतिक्रमे तदर्थत्वान्मुख्येन वेदसंयोगः). Vide तन्त्रवा. pp. 810 and above p. 1290 n. 2108; शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. III. 3. 33 quotes this sūtra.

गुणलोपे च मुख्यस्य — This is जै X. 2. 63. The words क्रिया स्यात् (or भवति) are to be understood.

गोबलीवर्दन्याय — In such a sentence as गाव आनीयन्तां बलीवर्दाश्च, the separate mention of balīvardas that are really included under 'gāvaḥ' is due to the fact that bulls are more intractable than cows and require special attention and effort. This is often used in Dharmaśāstra works. Vide मिता० on या. III. 312–313, स्मृतिच. (on व्यवहार) pp. 66, 67, 102, 169, 280, 300, कुल्लूक on मनु VIII. 28, व्य. म. p. 2 and H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 526 note 966.

गौणमुख्ययोर्मुख्ये कार्यसंप्रत्ययः — Vide शबर on जै. III. 2. 1. This न्याय is also cited as मुख्यगौणयोः ... संप्रत्ययः. शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. IV. 13. 12 cites it. मुख्य and गौण respectively mean 'primary sense' and 'secondary sense.' The महाभाष्य has the परिभाषा 'गौण ... संप्रत्ययः' on वार्तिक 1 on पा. I. 1. 15 and on वार्तिक 4 on पा. VI. 3. 46. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 725, note 1399.

ग्रहैकत्वन्याय — जै. III. 1. 13–15 based on दशापवित्रेण ग्रहं संमार्ष्टि (तै. सं. III. 2.2.3). Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 589 note 1380 and above p. 1285–86 and n. 2098.

चतुर्धाकरणन्याय — जै. III. 1. 26–27. Vide मी. न्या. प्र. p. 261, अर्थसंग्रह p. 24. Vide vol. IV, p. 670 n 1517.

छत्रिन्याय — Vide शबर on जै. I. 4. 23 (यथा छत्रिणो गच्छन्तीत्येकेन छत्रिणा सर्वे लक्ष्यन्ते), तन्त्रवा. on I. 4. 13, p. 347, टुप्टीका on जै. IV. 4. 1 p. 1270 and VII. 3. 7, p. 1552 and H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 500–501. शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. III. 3. 34 employs it in explaining ऋतं पिबन्तौ (कठोप. III. 1).

जर्तिलयवाग्वा जुहुयात् — This appears like a विधि, but it is only an अर्थवाद for praising पयोहोम. The vedic passage is in तै. सं. V. 4. 3. 2 and जै. X. 8. 7 deals with it. भामती on वे. सू. III 3. 18 relies on it.

जातेष्टिन्याय — जै. IV. 3. 38–39 on तै. सं. II. 2. 5. 3 वैश्वानरं द्वादशकपालं निर्वपेत् पुत्रे जाते. Though the performer of the rite is the father, the fruit accrues to the son that is born. Vide मिता. on या. II. 56 and III. 220, श्राद्ध. वि. p. 18, व्यव. म. p. 253–54, बाल. मी. p. 136 (Ānan. ed.)

जुहून्याय — जै. IV. 3. 1 based on passages like यस्य पर्णमयी जुहूर्भवति न स पापं श्लोकं शृणोति (in तै. सं. III. 5. 7. 2). Such sentences are not फलविधिs, but merely अर्थवादs.

तक्रकौण्डिन्यन्याय or ब्राह्मणकौण्डिन्यन्याय — Vide तन्त्रवा. p. 860 (दधि ब्राह्मणेभ्यो दीयतां तक्रं कौण्डिन्याय), श्लोकवा. (अपवाद, verse 15). If only the words दधि ... दीयतां were uttered, कौण्डिन्य being a ब्राह्मण would be included; but if the whole sentence be used he would be excluded from the first part. The महाभाष्य frequently cites this nyāya, e. g. on वार्तिक 4 on पा. VI. 1. 2 and वार्तिक 1 on पा. I. 1. 47 and on वार्तिक 2 on पा. VI. 2. 1; vide मिता. on या. III. 257 for this maxim.

तत्प्रख्यन्याय — जै. I. 4. 4 (तत्प्रख्यं चान्यशास्त्रम्), which means तस्य गुणस्य प्रख्यं ज्ञापकं अन्यच्छास्त्रं यत्र भवति. In तै. सं. I. 5. 9. 1 we read अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति (स्वर्गकामः). Here अग्निहोत्र is the name (नामधेय) of a rite (अग्नये होत्रं हामो यस्मिन्) and not a गुणविधि. Vide मी. न्या. प्र. p. 64, धर्मद्वैतनिर्णय p. 3, अर्थसंग्रह pp. 4 and 20.

तद्व्यपदेशन्याय — जै. I. 4. 5. The example is श्येनेनाभिचरन् यजेत. Here the word श्येन (meaning 'hawk') is applied to the rite called śyena, because it resembles the bird in its swift action. Vide मी. न्या. प्र. p. 238 (तेन व्यपदेशः उपमानम्। तदन्यथानुपपत्त्येति यावत्) and p. 1245 above.

दण्डापूपन्याय or दण्डापूपिकनीति — This is very often employed in धर्मशास्त्र works. Vide विश्वरूप on या. I. 147 and III. 257, मिता. on या. II. 126, स्मृतिच. on व्यवहार pp. 142, 146, 242, 249, 283, 296, 301, 315, 326, दायभाग X. 30, दायतत्त्व p. 170, व्य. म. p. 131 (and my notes on the same at pp. 221–222). For the derivation of दण्डापूपिक, vide अलङ्कारसर्वस्व on अर्थापत्ति p. 196 and जयरथ thereon.

दर्विहोमन्याय — जै. VIII. 4. 1, तन्त्रवा. p 115 on जै. I. 2. 7, मी. न्या. प्र. p. 149. In this compound word होम is the principal word and the word दर्वि is उपसर्जन (or अप्रधान). Therefore दर्विहोम is the name of a rite.

दशहरान्याय — Vide प्रायश्चित्तप्रकरण of भवदेव p. 18, प्राय. विवेक p. 81, शुद्धितत्त्व pp. 240–241. There is a व्रत on the 10th tithi of the bright half of Jyeṣṭha called दशहरा, since it removes ten sins. The maxim means that in certain cases, by a single performance one may be able to secure several objects.

दृष्टं प्रयोजनमुत्सृज्य न शक्यमदृष्टं कल्पयितुम्।
दृष्टे फले अदृष्टफलकल्पना अन्याय्या।
दृष्टे सति अदृष्टकल्पनाऽन्याय्या।
दृष्टे संभवत्यदृष्टस्यान्याय्यत्वम्।
Vide शबर on जै. IX. 3. 3 p. 1745, on जै. X. 2. 23 p. 1835 and on X. 2. 34 p. 1838, मी. न्या. प्र. p. 201, एकादशीतत्त्व p. 89, भामती on वे. सू. III. 3. 14 and H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 837 n 1628 and above p. 1260 note 2051.

देहलीदीपन्याय-देहली door-sill. A lamp thereon sheds light inside the room as well as outside. This is the same as प्रासाददीपन्याय below. प्रदीपवत् occurs in जै. XI. 1. 61; vide शबर thereon. व्य. म. p. 149 explaining या. II. 139 employs it.

द्वयोः प्रणयन्तिन्याय — जै. VII. 3. 19–25; Relied upon and explained in Mit. on Yāj. II. 135, दायभाग XI. 5. 16 p. 194 and व्यव. प्र. pp. 500–502 and 535; vide H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 704–705 note 1347a for explanation.

धेनुकिशोरन्याय — जै. VII. 4. 7 (in which the words यथा धेनुः किशोरेण occur); शबर explains it clearly. धेनुः ordinarily means 'cow', but किशोर means 'foal'. Therefore in कृष्णकिशोरा धेनुः, धेनु means 'mare'.

न तौ पशौ करोति न सोमे — जै. X. 8. 5 and XII. 1. 7. तौ refers to आज्यभागौ; vide व्यवहारसार p. 231 (part of नृसिंहप्रसाद), द्व. मी. p 182 and above p 1249.

न विधौ परः शब्दार्थः — means that it is not permissible to hold that in a विधिवाक्य a word therein has a meaning other than the direct one. The कल्पतरु on भामती (on वे. सू. I. 1. 1 p. 10) explains 'विधायके शब्दे परो लक्ष्यः शब्दार्थो न भवति'; vide शबर on IV. 4. 19 (which says अनुवादे च लक्षणा न्याय्या न विधौ) and also on IV. 1. 8, where the ten यज्ञायुध (स्फ्य wooden sword etc.) mentioned in तै. सं. I. 6. 8. 2–3 are held to be an अनुवाद and not a विधि. Vide पू. मा. I. 2. p. 298 and भ. पा. p. 372, वृ. मी. p. 180.

नष्टाश्वदग्धरथन्याय — Vide शबर on जै. II. 1. 1 p. 376, तन्त्रवा. on जै. I. 2. 7 and on III. 3. 11 p. 818. This is an old न्याय. वार्तिक 16 on पा. I. 1. 50 is संप्रयोगो वा नष्टाश्वदग्धरथवत् and the महाभाष्य explains 'तवाश्वो नष्टो ममापि रथो दग्धः, उभौ संप्रयुज्यावहै इति।'. मेधा. on मनु V. 51 and भामती on I. 1. 4. p. 108 mention it. The idea is इतरेतरोपकारकत्व.

न हि निन्दा निन्द्यं निन्दितुं प्रयुज्यते, अपि तु विधेयं स्तोतुम् — vide H. of Dh. II. p. 581 n 1359 and above p. 96 n 237 for passages from Śabara and Tantravārtika. The मिता. on या. III. 221 paraphrases it.

न ह्येकस्य शब्दस्यानेकार्थता सत्यां गतौ न्याय्या —Vide शबर on जै. VIII. 3. 22 and IX. 4. 18 and the न्याय 'अन्यायश्चानेकार्थत्वम्' above p. 1339.

नागृहीतविशेषणान्याय — This is often expressed in the form नागृहीतविशेषणा विशेष्ये बुद्धिरुत्पद्यते (as in शबर on जै. VII. 2, 13) or as न ह्यप्रतीते विशेषणे विशिष्टं केचन प्रत्येतुमर्हन्ति (as in शबर on जै. I. 3, 33 p. 304). Vide तन्त्रवा. pp. 304, 326, 916, एका. तत्त्व p. 15, शुद्धितत्त्व p. 313, व्य. म. p. 89 (and the present author's notes thereon pp. 117-118).

नास्ति वचनस्यातिभारः — This न्याय occurs very frequently in शबर and धर्मशास्त्र works in different forms, but the meaning is the same viz. 'there is nothing too heavy (i. e. impossible to prescribe) for a sacred text.' Vide शबर on जै. *II, 2. 27* (किमिव हि वचनं न कुर्यान्नास्ति...भारः), *on* जै. *III. 2. 3, X. 5. 11;* on जै VI. 1. 44, the wording is 'न हि वचनस्य किंचिदलभ्यं नाम'. शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. III. 3. 41 and III. 4. 32 employs it. Vide विश्वरूप on या. I. 58 (referred to in H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 525 n 1224), मिता. on याज्ञ. III. 298 (H. of Dh. vol. IV. p. 66 n 161, परा. मा. II. 1 p. 202 and II. 2 p. 64).

निमित्तगतं विशेषणमविवक्षितम् — Similar to आर्त्यधिकरणन्याय. Vide विश्वरूप on या. III. 212.

निमित्तावृत्तौ नैमित्तिकावृत्तिः — जै. VI. 2. 27-28 and 29. Such passages as भिन्ने जुहोति स्कन्ने जुहोति really lay down that whenever such a *nimitta* as breaking occurs a fresh homa has to be performed. Vide मेधा. on मनु XI. 220 (एतद्ब्रह्मास्तथा &c.) and मिता. on या. I. 81.

निषादस्थपतिन्याय — जै. VI. 1. 51-52. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 46, vol. IV. p. 24 n 58 and above pp. 1295-96 and n 2121. It is employed by परा. मा. I. 1. p. 49, प्राय. वि. p. 132, व्य. म. p. 112.

न्यायसाम्य — नि. सि. p. 67 states that rules about śrāddha *on* a solar eclipse apply by analogy to śrāddha *on* a lunar eclipse.

पङ्कप्रक्षालनन्याय — *This is expressed in the half verse* 'प्रक्षालनाद्धि पङ्कस्य दूराद्स्पर्शनं वरम्' introduced by विश्वरूप on या. I. 210 with the words तथा च लौकिकाः. This half verse is वनपर्व 2. 49, which reads श्रेयो न स्पर्शनं नृणाम् and the other half is धर्मार्थं यस्य वित्तेहा वरं तस्य निरीहता।'. शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. III. 2. 22 quotes it.

पदार्थप्राबल्याधिकरण — जै. I. 3. 5-7 on the place of आचमन in view of the words वेदं कृत्वा वेदिं कुर्वीत and explained by शबर on I. 3. 7.

पदार्थानुसमय — जै. V. 2. 1-2 and vide काण्डानुसमय above p. 1342.

परमतमप्रतिषिद्धमनुमतं भवति—This is like 'silence shows consent' — Vide कृत्य. श्री. p. 82 and H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 669 n 1264 and शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. II. 4. 12.

पर्णमयीन्याय — जै. III. 6. 1-8; certain passages like यस्य पर्णमयी जुहूर्भवति न स पापं श्लोकं शृणोति occur in तै. सं. III. 5. 7. 2 without express reference to any topic. They are to be applicable to the modifications. Vide मी. न्या. प्र. p. 117 and भामती on वे. सू. I. 1. 4 pp. 123-124.

पशुन्याय— जै. IV. 1. 11 and टुप्टीका pp. 1203-5 on the Vedic text यो दीक्षितो यदग्नीषोमीयं पशुमालभते. The emphasis is that both एकत्व and पुंस्त्व are to be insisted on.

पशुपुरोडाशन्याय — जै. XII. 1. 1-6; vide प्रायश्चित्तप्रकरण of भवदेव p. 20, प्राय. वि. p. 85 and गोविन्दानन्द's तत्त्वार्थकौमुदी on the latter and n 2205.

पिष्टपेषणन्याय — Occurs in Śabara's Bhāṣya on Jai IX. 2. 3, XII. 2. 16, तन्त्रवा. I. 2. 31 p. 147. पिष्टपेषण — Means grinding what is already well ground and therefore unnecessary repetition (of arguments).

पृष्ठाकोटन्याय — Literally means 'bending the back again and again to observe each of many objects lying on the ground.' Vide शबर on जै. II. 1. 32 and तन्त्रवा. thereon p. 434. The मिता. on या. III. 216 employs it.

प्रकृतिप्रत्ययौ प्रत्ययार्थं सह ब्रूतः — Vide शबर on जै III. 4. 12 p. 922 and on जै. XI. 1. 22 p. 2013, तन्त्रवा. on जै. II. 1. 1 p. 380, III. 1. 12 p. 674, III. 4.12 p. 902, III. 7. 10 p. 1080. It occurs in the महाभाष्य on वार्तिक 2 on पा. III. 1. 67. Vide above pp. 1235-38 n 2010.

प्रतिनिधिन्याय — जै. VI. 3. 13-17, स्मृतिच. (on श्राद्ध p. 460). It means श्रुतद्रव्यापचारे द्रव्यान्तरं प्रतिनिधाय प्रयोगः कर्तव्यः.

प्रतिनिमित्तं नैमित्तिकशास्त्रमावर्तते — Vide the न्याय 'निमित्तावृत्तौ' etc. above, मिता. on या. III. 263-64 and 288 for this form of the न्याय.

प्रतिपदाधिकरण — मी. न्या. प्र. p. 47. The first part of the interpretation of जै. II. 1. 1 by Śabara is so called and the 2nd part is called भावार्थाधिकरण.

प्रतिप्रधानं गुणावृत्तिः — शबर on जै. III. 3. 14 p. 844; परा. मा. I. 1. p. 391 illustrates it.

प्रथमातिक्रमे कारणाभावात् — जै. X. 5. 1 and 6 (on which शबर says ये क्रमवन्त आरभ्यन्ते प्रथमाद्युपक्रमितव्याः), तन्त्रवा. on जै. III. 2.20 p. 772 and on III. 4. 51 p. 988, व्य. म. p. 134.

प्रधानमल्लनिबर्हणन्याय — Lit. 'Crushing the principal wrestler', the idea being that lesser champions would be regarded as vanquished if the principal wrestler is vanquished. Vide शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. I. 4. 28 and II. 1.12.

प्रधानस्य चोद्दिश्यमानस्य विशेषणमविवक्षितम् — Vide टुप्टीका on जै. VII. 1. 2, p. 1526 and the न्याय 'उद्दिश्यमानस्य' etc. above.

प्रयोजनमनुद्दिश्य न मन्दोऽपि प्रवर्तते — Vide श्लोकवा. (सम्बन्धाक्षेप॰ verse 55 p. 653 quoted above on p. 1179 n 1917.

प्रस्तरप्रहरणन्याय — जै. III. 2. 11-15 referring to the direction in दर्शपूर्णमास 'सूक्तवाकेन प्रस्तरं प्रहरति' (the priest casts the bunch of kuśas called *prastara* into the fire to the accompaniment of Sūktavāka mantra, which thus becomes an aṅga). For प्रस्तर, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1013 and for सूक्तवाकमन्त्र H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 1073 n 2398.

प्रासादवीपन्याय—same as देहलीदीपन्याय. Vide शबर on जै. XII. 1. 1 and 3.

प्रैयङ्गवन्याय—Vide तन्त्रवा. on जै. II. 1. 12, p. 415. It refers to the example cited by शबर on जै. I. 3. 8 'तत्र केचिद्दीर्घशूकेषु यवशब्दं प्रयुञ्जते केचित्प्रियङ्गुषु'.

फलवत्संनिधावफलं तदङ्गम्—In जै. IV. 4. 34 (which is a lengthy sūtra) we have the words तत्पुनर्मुख्यलक्षणं यत्फलवत्त्वं तत्संनिधावसंयुक्तं तदङ्गं स्यात्'. Vide शबर on जै. IV. 4. 19; कुल्लूक on मनु II. 101–102 employs it and so does the Śaṅkara-bhāṣya on V. S. II. 1. 14. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. p. 481 n. 1082.

बर्हिर्न्याय — जै. III. 2. 1. शबर cites the mantra बर्हिर्देवसदनं दामि (I cut off barhis as an abode for the deity) and remarks that the mukhya sense is to be taken and not gauṇa (secondary sense, based on similarity).

ब्राह्मणकौण्डिन्यन्याय—Vide तक्रकौण्डिन्यन्याय above p. 1343. The मिता. on या. III. 257 refers to it.

ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्याय—शबर on जै. II. 1. 43 has 'इतो ब्राह्मणा भोज्यन्तामितः परिव्राजका इति।'. The भामती on वे. सू. III. 1. 11 states that this nyāya means the same thing as गोबलीवर्दन्याय. The शाङ्करभाष्य mentions it on वे. सू. I. 4. 16, II. 3. 15, III. 1. 11. Vide सुबोधिनी on या. II. 96 (ed. by Mr. Gharpure).

ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्याय — मेधा. on मनु VII. 35 employs it. वसिष्ठ also was a brāhmaṇa but he may be separately mentioned as he was most eminent in *tapas*.

भावार्थाधिकरण — जै. II. 1. 1, मी. न्या. प्र. p. 128 and p. 1236 n 2010 above.

भूतभव्यसमुच्चारणन्याय or भूतभव्यसमुच्चारणे भूतं भव्यायोपदिश्यते — शबर frequently mentions it as on जै. II. 1. 4, III. 4. 40, IV. 1. 18, VI. 1. 1, IX. 1. 9. The टुप्टीका on जै. IV. 1. 18 explains 'भूतं द्रव्यं भव्यां क्रियां निर्वर्तयतीति क्रियातोऽदृष्टम्'. व्य. म. p. 111 mentions it; vide the present author's notes thereon pp. 173 ff and H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 695 n 1322.

भूयसान्याय or भूयसां स्यात्सधर्मत्वम् — based on जै. XII. 2. 22 (विप्रतिषिद्धधर्माणां समवाये भूयसां स्यात् सधर्मत्वम्). When there is a composite sacrifice comprising several rites the various details of which present conflicts the procedure to be adopted is such as to secure the performance of the details common to the largest number; this is relied upon in स्मृतिच. (on श्राद्ध p. 498) and व्यव. नि. p. 202.

माषमुद्गन्याय — जै. VI. 3 20. The rule is that if a substance prescribed for a sacrifice cannot be had, a similar substance may be used (as पूतीक for सोम mentioned by Śabara on Jai. VI. 3. 14); but where a substance is expressly forbidden it cannot be employed as a substitute, even when it is similar to the one prescribed. If mudga pulse cannot be had māṣa pulse cannot be used, as Tai. S. V. 1. 8. 1 declares māṣa grains to be unfit for sacrifice. Vide मिता. on या. II. 126, दायभाग XIII. 16 (in both this nyāya is mentioned), प्राय. तत्त्व p. 482, व्यव. प्र. p. 555.

मिथःसम्बन्धन्याय — same as वार्त्रघ्नीन्याय (जै. III. 1. 23).

मिथोऽसम्बन्धन्याय — जै. III. 1. 22. and शबर thereon and मव. पा. p. 89. A guṇavākya (clause laying down a subsidiary matter) is not to be taken as subsidiary to another guṇavākya, as both are subsidiary to the main purpose and are of equal status. There are two rites viz. Agnyādheya

and Pavamāna offerings and it is stated that one of these is subordinate to the other. Both subserve the same purpose, viz. being employed in Darśapūrṇamāsa and other sacrifices. A Vedic text states that vessels made of Varana and Vaikaṅkata wood are fit for sacrifices, but a vessel of Varaṇa wood is not to be used for homa while one of Vaikaṅkata may be used. Both classes of vessels are subsidiary to sacrifices, but the text about not using Varaṇa vessel in homa is of a general character. Therefore, one of the two clauses is not subordinate to the other. Hence Vaikaṅkata vessels are to be used in yāgas in which homa is requisite, but Varaṇa vessels are not to be used in such yāgas.

मुख्यगौणयोश्च मुख्ये संप्रत्ययः — शबर on जै. III. 2. 1. Vide above गौणमुख्ययोश्च etc.

मुख्यापचारे (or मुख्यालाभे) प्रतिनिधिः शास्त्रार्थः - जै. VI. 3. 13-17; vide तिथितत्त्व p. 13, व्रत. मी. p. 206.

यथाशक्तिन्याय — जै. VI. 3. 1-7; vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p 373 and above pp. 1163-64, धर्मद्वैतनिर्णय p. 105, एका. तत्त्व pp. 18, 26.

यववराहाधिकरण — जै. I. 3. 9 and above p. 1293 note 2116.

यश्चोभयोः पक्षयोर्दोषो न तमेकश्चोद्यो भवति or यश्चोभ ... नासावेकं पक्षं निवर्तयति or यश्चो ... नासावेकस्य वाच्यः —Vide शबर on जै. VIII. 3. 7 and 14 (pp. 1616, 1619) and X. 1. 25 p. 1816.

यस्य येनार्थसम्बन्ध इति न्यायात् - This is part of the verse यस्य येनाभिसम्बन्धो दूरस्थेनापि तस्य सः। अर्थतो ह्यसमर्थानामानन्तर्यमकारणम्। q by न्यायसुधा (p. 1076) on तन्त्रवा. III. 1. 27 as वृद्धश्लोक; तन्त्रवा. p. 744 has यस्य ... सम्बन्ध इति न्यायात्. Vide above p. 1298 n 2124. This न्याय is employed also in works on Poetics, e. g. the व्यक्तिविवेक-व्याख्या p. 39 (TSS) and by अभिनवभारती on नाट्यशास्त्र (G. O. S. vol. I. p. 210 'तथापि यस्य येनार्थसम्बन्ध इत्यर्थक्रम आदर्तव्यो न शब्द इति').

यावद्वचनं वाचनिकम् — Vide शबर on जै. V. 4. 11 (याव...कं न तत्र न्यायः क्रमते) and on V. 3 12 (याव...कं न सदृशमुपसंक्रामति). The idea is: in the case of an authoritative text that much only is to be accepted as covered by it which is expressed by the words used and that it should not be made applicable to other cases on the ground of similarity or analogy. Vide तन्त्रवा. on जै. III. 5. 19, भामती on वे. सू. IV. 1. 4 and on IV. 3. 4; मेधा° on मनु X. 127 applies this maxim. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 469 n 1101.

युगपद्वृत्तिद्वयविरोधन्याय — One and the same word in a *vidhi* cannot be taken to have been used at the same time in the primary sense as well as in the secondary sense. Vide जै. III. 2 1 and शबर thereon, न्या. प्र. p. 92 and notes there on by the present author (pp. 129-131), व्यवहारमयूख III. 30 p. 67 and H. of Dh. vol III, p. 725 note 1399 and above pp. 1292-93 notes 2112-14.

योगसिद्ध्यधिकरण — जै. IV. 3. 27-28. The ज्योतिष्टोम does not simultaneously bring out all the rewards but only one after another. The word occurs in sūtra 28 itself and योगसिद्धि means पर्याय according to शबर. Vide मेधा. on मनु XI. 220, शुद्धितत्त्व p. 239 (for explanation), प्राय. वि. p. 78 and प्राय. प्रकरण of भवदेव (p. 18).

रथकाराधिकरणन्याय — Vide जै. VI. 1. 44–50, मी. न्या. प्र. p. 113 and above p. 1290 n 2110 and परा. मा. I. 1. p. 48.

रात्रिसत्रन्याय — जै. IV. 3. 17–19 and H. of Db. vol. IV. p. 602 note 1367, above p. 1227 n 1995 and वृत्त. मी. p. 207, भामती on शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. I. 1. 4 p. 111 as part of the Pūrvapakṣa.

रूढिर्योगमपहरति — This means that the conventional meaning of a word is to be preferred to the etymological meaning as in the case of the word 'rathakāra' in Jai. VI. 1. 44 ff.; vide परा. मा. I. 1. p. 300. As against this one must note another nyāya sometimes relied upon viz. योगसम्भवे परिभाषाया अयुक्तत्वात् (used by the मिता. on या. II. 143 about the meaning of the word स्त्रीधन). Vide H. of Dh. vol II. p. 780 n 1508 and the मी. न्या. प्र. pp. 112–113.

रेवत्यधिकरणन्याय — जै. II. 2. 27 and मी. न्या. प्र. pp 40–42.

लक्षणा ह्यदृष्टकल्पनाया ज्यायसी — Vide शबर on जै. I. 1. p. 7 and I. 4. 2 p. 324.

वर्चोन्याय — जै. III. 8. 25–27. In दर्शपूर्णमास the adhvaryu priest recites 'ममाग्ने वर्चो विहवेष्वस्तु' (तै. सं. I. 4. 5). The reward, however, goes to the sacrificer and not to the adhvaryu, as the latter works for a fee.

वाजपेयन्याय — *जै. I. 4. 6–8. In the sentence वाजपेयेन स्वाराज्यकामो यजेत, वाजपेय* is the name of a yāga and does not lay down any detail about a sacrifice, mentioned in Mit. on Yāj. I. 81.

वार्त्रघ्नीन्याय — जै. III. 1. 23. Tai. S. II. 5. 2. 5 lays down that the Vārtraghnī verses are recited on Paurṇamāsī and the Vṛdhanvatī verses on Amāvāsyā These two are prescribed in relation to sacrifices that require the recitation of two anuvākyās. There is only one anuvākyā at the Darśa or Paurṇamāsī rite; therefore these verses cannot be used in Darśapūrṇamāsa. But two anuvākyās are known to be used in the Ājyabhāgas, which are subsidiary offerings in Darśa-Pūrṇamāsa. Therefore, the two anuvākyās 'Vārtraghnī' and 'Vṛdhanvatī' are to be connected with Ājyabhāgas alone and not with the principal rite.

विधिवन्निगदाधिकरण — Vide above pp. 1239–40 note 2015; दायभाग II. 30 (स्थावरं द्विपदं ... न विक्रयः) remarks 'कर्तव्यपदमयमत्राध्याहार्यम्). This is a विधि, though there is no word expressing exhortation.

विश्वजिन्न्याय — जै. IV. 3. 15–16. Where no fruit or reward is expressly prescribed for a sacrifice *svarga* is the reward. This is so with the Viśvajit sacrifice in which the sacrificer had to donate all that he owned at the time of the sacrifice; mentioned by मेधा. on मनु II. 2, परा. मा. I. 1 p. 148, एका. तत्त्व p. 23.

विधौ लक्षणा अन्याय्या — Vide शबर on जै. I. 2. 29, IV. 4. 19 and the न्याय 'न विधौ परः शब्दार्थः' above. मलमासतत्त्व (p. 760) relies on this.

वैश्वदेवन्याय — जै. I. 4. 13–16. वैश्वदेव is the first *parvan* of the four parvans of Cāturmāsyas. It is a name (*nāmadheya*) and not a guṇavidhi. It is employed in the वृत्त. मी. *p.* 239.

वैश्वानराधिकरणन्याय — Vide जातेष्टिन्याय.

शाखान्तरन्याय — जै. II. 4. 8–33. It is the same as सर्वशाखाप्रत्ययन्याय below.

श्रुतिलक्षणाविशये च श्रुतिर्न्याय्या न लक्षणा — Vide शबर on IV. 1. 23, IV. 1. 46, IV. 2-30.

षोडशिन्याय -- जै. X. 8. 6; *vide above p. 1249 n 2030 on* अतिरात्रे षोडशिनं गृह्णाति and नातिरात्रे... गृह्णाति, अर्थसंग्रह p. 24.

संयोगपृथक्त्वन्याय — जै. IV. 3. 5-7. The word संयोगपृथक्त्व occurs in जै. IV. 3. 5 itself; vide above p. 86 note 217; मेधा. on मनु II. 107, परा. मा. I. 1. 60, प्राय. तत्त्व. p. 474, एका. तत्त्व pp. 29-30, तिथितत्त्व p. 44, नि. सि. p. 84.

सकृत्कृते कृतः शास्त्रार्थः — Vide शबर on जै. XI. 1. 28 and XII. 3. 10; employed in एका. तत्त्व p. 32 and उद्वाहतत्त्व p. 133; it is mentioned in the महाभाष्य on वार्तिक 4 on पा. VI. 1. 84. This nyāya has a limited application and often the maxim निमित्तावृत्तौ etc. (i. e. repetition) applies.

सकृच्छ्रुतः शब्दस्तमेवार्थं गमयति—Vide दायभाग III. 29-30 p. 67, मद. पा. p. 369, accepted in 6 Cal. 119. 126 (F. B.) and in L. R. 41 I. A. p. 290 at pp. 303-4.

समं स्यादश्रुतित्वात् — This is the पूर्वपक्षसूत्र in जै. X. 3. 53-55, but it is held generally applicable unless there is a special or express provision for unequal distribution. This is followed in मिता. on याज्ञ. II. 265, दायभाग IV. 8 *p. 80 (on* स्त्रीधनविभाग*),* स्मृतिच. *(II. pp. 152 and 285),* कुल्लूक *on* मनु *III. 1.* (समं स्यादश्रुतत्वादिति न्यायेन प्रति ... द्वादशवर्षाणि व्रताचरणम्), परा. मा. I. 2. p. 362, मदनरत्न (on व्यवहार) p. 204.

सप्तदशसामिधेनीन्याय — जै. III. 6. 9. Passages like सप्तदश सामिधेनीरनुब्रूयात् in Ait. Br. 1. 1 that occur without being attached to any particular sacrifice are applicable only to vikṛtis and not to the model (prakṛti) sacrifice; vide मिता. on या. I. 256.

सर्वपरिदानाधिकरण — जै. III. 4. 17 based on Tai. S. II. 6. 10. 1-2 which prohibits threatening or striking a brāhmaṇa. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III, p. 515 note 937-938 and प्राय. तत्त्व p. 479, प्राय. वि. p. 6.

सर्वशक्त्यधिकरणन्याय — Vide यथाशक्तिन्याय and एका. तत्त्व pp. 18, 26.

सर्वशाखाप्रत्ययन्याय — जै. II. 4. 8-33. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 870 note 1693, vol. IV. pp 89-90 note 211, pp. 453-55 note 1011 and मिता. on या. III. 325, अपरार्क p. 1053, स्मृतिच. (I. p. 5), मद. पा. pp. 11 and 91, शुद्धितत्त्व pp. 378, 380 and above p. 1273 n 2074.

सामान्यविशेषन्याय—Vide शबर on जै. VII. 3. 16 (बाध्यते च सामान्यं विशेषेण) and तन्त्रवा. p. 1030 on जै. III. 6. 9 'तत्र नाम विशेषेण सामान्यस्य निराक्रिया । प्रत्यक्षो यत्र सम्बन्धो विशेषेण प्रतीयते । तुल्यप्रमाणको हि विशेषो बाधको भवति न दुर्बलप्रमाणकः' and p. 1120; vide for examples स्मृतिच. (on व्यवहार pp. 142, 299, 381) and परा. मा. I, p. 233.

सामर्थ्याधिकरण — जै. I. 4. 25. Vide above p. 1291 note 2111.

सारस्वतौ भवतः — जै. V. 1. 14; vide above pp. 1315-16 n 2164 and स्मृतिच. (on व्यवहार p. 297), सुबोधिनी (on पितरौ) on p. 72 (text) and p. 183 (tr. by Mr. J. R. Gharpure).

सार्थक्यन्याय — जै. I. 2. 1 and 7; vide p. 1284 and शबर on जै. II. 2. 6 and on *III. 1. 18 (on* आनर्थक्यात्तदङ्गेषु*).* अनर्थक *means either 'meaningless'* or 'purposeless'.

सुवर्णधारणन्याय — जै. III. 4. 20–24. In तै. ब्रा. II, 2. 4. 6 there is a passage not connected with any specific sacrifice viz. 'सुवर्णं हिरण्यं भार्यम्' (one should wear bright gold). This is a puruṣadharma and not a sarvaprakaraṇa-dharma. Vide मिता. on या. II. 135–136, where this is used as an argument against the view that all wealth is for *yajña*.

सूक्तवाकन्याय — Vide जै. III. 2. 16–19 and प्रस्तरप्रहरणन्याय (p. 1346) for the meaning of सूक्तवाक and प्रस्तर. In these sūtras it is established that the whole सूक्तवाक is not to be recited in both Paurṇamāsa-iṣṭi and Darśa-iṣṭi, but only those portions of it that refer respectively to the deities of the two iṣṭis.

स्थालीपुलाकन्याय — The word स्थालीपुलाक occurs in Jai. VII. 4. 12 itself; vide शबर on जै. VIII. 1. 11 and तन्त्रवा. on जै. III. 5. 19 p. 998. The महाभाष्य knew it since it says on वार्तिक 15 to पा. I. 4. 23 'पर्याप्तो श्लोकः पुलाकः स्थाल्या निवर्शनाय'.

स्थूणानिखननन्याय — *Fixing a post firmly in the earth by frequently pushing it down and about*; occurs in शाबरभाष्य on जै. VII. 2. 1 and शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 34 and III. 3. 53.

स्वर्गकामाधिकरण — जै. VI. 1. 1–3, referred to in H. of Dh. vol. IV. p. 169.

हेतुवन्निगदाधिकरण — जै. I. 2. 26–30. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 676 and notes 1276–77, विश्वरूप on या. III. 263, मलमासतत्त्व p. 760 for application.

होलाकाधिकरण — जै. I. 3. 15–23. Vide above p. 1281 n 2093 for explanation.

SECTION VIII

Relation of Sāṅkhya, Yoga and Tarka to Dharmaśāstra

CHAPTER XXXI

Dharmaśāstra and Sāṅkhya.

Sāṅkhya is one of the well-known six *darśanas* (philosophical points of view).

Śaṅkarācārya in his bhāṣya [2208] on V. S. II. 2. 17 says that Manu and others who were deeply versed in the Veda took up to some extent in their works the doctrine of *pradhāna* being the cause of the world with the idea of relying on that part of its doctrine viz. the effect is (already) existent in the cause. Similarly, on V. S. I. 4. 28 he says that great effort was made by the Sūtrakāra and himself for refuting the doctrines of the Sāṅkhya system (and not for the refutation of the theory of atoms being the cause of the world), since the Sāṅkhya system is near to the Vedānta as it accepts the view of the non-difference of cause and effect and as some Dharmasūtra writers like Devala have had resort to it in their works. On V. S. II. 1. 3 Śaṅkarācārya remarks that, though there are many smṛtis dealing with metaphysical topics, great effort was made for the refutation of Sāṅkhya and Yoga only, since the two systems are well-known in the world as means of securing the highest goal of man, as they have been accepted by *śiṣṭas* (respectable and learned people) and are supported by Vedic indications in their favour (as in Śvetāśvatara Up. 'tat-kāraṇam sāṅkhyayogābhipannam' VI. 13). It would be shown later on that Manu and Devala rely on and propound (some) Sāṅkhya doctrines.

2208. प्रधानकारणवादो वेदविद्भिरपि कैश्चिन्मन्वादिभिः सत्कार्यत्वाद्यंशोपजीवनाभिप्रायेणोपनिबद्धः। अयं तु परमाणुकारणवादो न कैश्चिदपि शिष्टैः केनचिदप्यंशेन परिगृहीत इत्यत्यन्तमेवानादरणीयो वेदवादिभिः। शाङ्कर on वे. सू. II. 2. 17 (अपरिग्रहाच्चात्यन्तमनपेक्षा); "ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम्"-इत्यारभ्य प्रधानकारणवादः सूत्रैरेव पुनः पुनराशङ्क्य निराकृतः तस्य हि पक्षस्योपोद्बलकानि कानिचिल्लिङ्गाभासानि वेदान्तेष्वापातेन मन्दमतीन्प्रतिभान्तीति। स च कार्यकारणानन्यत्वाभ्युपगमात्प्रत्यासन्नो वेदान्तवादस्य। देवलप्रभृतिभिश्च कैश्चिद्धर्मसूत्रकारैः स्वग्रन्थेष्वाश्रितस्तेन तत्प्रतिषेधे यत्नोऽतीव कृतो नाण्वादिकारणवादप्रतिषेधे।" शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. I. 4, 28.

It would not be irrelevant to say a few words about the origin and development of the Sāṅkhya system. This (rise of Sāṅkhya) is one of the most difficult problems in Indian philosophy. A good many works and papers have been written on the Sāṅkhya system.[2109] As to what the original Sāṅkhya teaching revised in the Sāṅkhyakārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa was, no generally accepted answer can be given. From the 5th century A. D. at least the Sāṅkhyakārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa has been regarded as the foremost exponent of the Sāṅkhya. The Sāṅkhyakārikā and a commentary on it were translated into Chinese about 546 A. D. by Paramārtha, originally a brāhmaṇa of Bhāradvāja gotra and a śramaṇa from Ujjayinī (vide BEFEO, 1904, p. 60). Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. I. 4. 11 quotes the whole of the 3rd verse of the Sāṅkhyakārikā and the first quarter of it on V. S. I. 4. 8. But the Sāṅkhya system, it appears, went through several phases. Chinese sources say that there were eighteen Sāṅkhya schools (p. 2 of Johnston's "Early Sāṅkhya," quoting Takakusu in BEFEO, 1904, p. 58).

There is the Sāṅkhyasūtra or Sāṅkhyapravacanasūtra attributed to Kapila (published with two commentaries viz. that of Aniruddha and parts of the *Tīkā* of Vedāntin Mahādeva edited by Garbe in B. I. Series 1881). This is a late work composed about 1400 A. D. as shown by Garbe in his Introduction and by

---

2209. Those interested in Sāṅkhya may consult the following: Fitz-Edward Hall's 'Introduction to Sāṅkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya' (B. I. Series 1856); 'Sāṅkhya-Kārikā' exposition of the system of Kapila, translation and notes by John Davies (first published in 1881, 2nd ed. in 1957, Calcutta); Richard Garbe's 'Die Sāṅkhya Philosophie', 1894, and Introduction to his edition of the Sāṅkhyapravacana-bhāṣya of Vijñānabhikṣu in the Harvard Oriental Series; 'Six systems of philosophy' by Prof. Max-Muller ed. of (1903) pp. 219–330; 'the Philosophy of the Upanishads' by Paul Deussen translated by A. S. Geden (1906) pp. 239–255; Prof. A B. Keith's Sāṅkhya system (1924); 'Early Sāṅkhya' by E. H. Johnston (Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain, 1937); Das-Gupta's 'Indian Philosophy', Vol. I, pp. 208–273 (1922); Dr. Radhakrishnan's 'Indian Philosophy'. Vol. II, pp. 248–335 (1927) and 'Philosophy, Eastern and Western', Vol. I, pp. 242–257; 'Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upaniṣads' by Prof. A. B. Keith, Vol. II, pp. 535–551; 'Beginning of Epic Sāṅkhya' by Dr. W. Ruben in ABORI, Vol. 37 (1956) pp. 174–189; 'Sāṅkhya in the Mokṣaparva' by Shri Jayadev Yogendra in J. of Bom. Uni. (1957), Vol. 26, New Series, Arts number, pp. 123–141; 'Studies in Sāṅkhya, Pañcaśikha and Caraka' in ABORI Vol. 38, pp. 140–147 and 'Studies in Sāṅkhya', the teaching of Pañcaśikha in the Mahābhārata' ABORI, Vol. 38, pp. 233–244, both by Shri V. M. Bedekar.

Fitz-Edward Hall in his learned Introduction to the edition of the Sāṅkhyapravacana-bhāṣya (B. I. Series, 1856). There is an edition of 23 sūtras called Tattvasamāsa with a commentary called Kramadīpikā in the Chowkhamba Sanskrit series which has also published several other brief late works that are passed over here. Several commentaries on the Sāṅkhyakārikā have been published. The earliest appears to be the one translated into Chinese by Paramārtha about 546 A. D., which has been reconstructed into Sanskrit from the Chinese by the learned Pandit Aiyaswami Sastri and published (in 1944) in the Sri. Venkatesvara Oriental Series with a valuable Introduction; another commentary styled Māṭharavṛtti was published (in 1922) in the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series. Dr. Belvalkar (in ABORI vol. V. pp. 133–161) contributed a long and scholarly paper on the Māṭharavṛtti in which he holds that the Māṭharavṛtti is the original of the commentary translated into Chinese by Paramārtha together with some accretions made from time to time, that Gauḍapāda's commentary is a simplified abridgment of the Māṭharavṛtti (p. 148), that the Māṭharavṛtti cannot be placed later than 450 A. D. (p. 155) and that Īśvarakṛṣṇa cannot be assigned to a date later than 250 A. D. (p. 168). Prof. A. B. Keith in 'Sāṅkhya system' (p. 51) places Īśvarakṛṣṇa at a date not later than 325 A. D. Another early commentary is the Yuktidīpikā of an unnamed author edited from a single ms. by Shri Pulinabehari Chakravarti in Calcutta Sanskrit Series (1938). This is a very valuable commentary and has been very competently edited even from a single ms, though there are a few gaps here and there. That commentary is replete with quotations and polemical discussions, mentions several Sāṅkhya teachers who differed among themselves and whose opinions are cited on many topics. For example, vide under Vindhyavāsin below. It mentions some ācāryas that are hardly ever mentioned in any Sāṅkhya work. It frequently cites an author called Pañcādhikaraṇa (vide pp. 6, 108, 114, 132, 144, 147, 148 where two Āryās apparently of Pañcādhikaraṇa are quoted). Another hitherto unknown Sāṅkhyācārya mentioned by this com. is Paurika on p. 169 and p. 175, who holds the surprising view[2210] that there is a separate *pradhāna* for each Puruṣa. Patañjali is frequently mentioned on pp. 32 (who denied the existence of

2210. प्रतिपुरुषमन्यत् प्रधानं शरीराद्यर्थं करोति। तेषां च माहात्म्यशरीरप्रधानं यदा प्रवर्तते तदेतराण्यपि, तन्निवृत्तौ च तेषामपि निवृत्तिरिति पौरिकः सांख्याचार्यो मन्यते। युक्ति॰ p. 169.

Ahaṅkāra), 108, 132 (there are 12 *karaṇas* and not 13 as S. Kārikā in verse 32 asserts), 145, 149, 175; Vārṣagaṇāḥ (in the plural) are mentioned on pp. 39, 67, 95, 102, 133, 145, 170; Vārṣagaṇa (pp. 6, 108) and Vārṣagaṇavīra (on pp. 72, 108, 175) styled bhagavān on p. 72 and Vṛṣagaṇavīra (on p. 103 probably meaning 'the son of Vṛṣagaṇa'); all these refer to the views of Vārṣagaṇas. Pañcaśikha (p. 31 in the plural, p. 61, p. 175) is mentioned and one passage which is quoted in the Vyāsabhāṣya (on Y. S. I. 4) and ascribed to Pañcaśikha by Vācaspati is quoted by the Yuktidīpikā on p. 41 as Śāstra. From pp. 113 and 129 it appears that the author of the com. was a Vedāntin.[2211] It is probable that he flourished between 500 and 700 A. D., since he quotes (on p, 39) Diṅnāga's definition of 'pratyakṣa' and is not cited by Vācaspati and other commentators on the Sāṅkhya.

. Gauḍapāda composed a commentary on the S. Kārikā but only on 69 verses published in the Ch. S. Series. The Commentary called Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī by the famous writer Vācaspatimiśra was published in the Chowkhamba S. S. in 1919. A commentary called Jayamaṅgalā ascribed to Śaṅkarācārya (in the colophon) on the S. Kārikā was published at Calcutta in 1933 by Sri H. Sarma with a brief but interesting Introduction by Principal Gopinatha Kaviraj (vide also I. H. Q. vol. V. pp. 417-431) where Sri H. Sarma tries to prove that the Jayamaṅgalā is earlier than Vācaspatimiśra. Vijñānabhikṣu composed (about 1550 A. D.) a bhāṣya on the Sāṅkhyapravacanasūtra. The Sūtrakāra and Vijñānabhikṣu make efforts to establish the impossible thesis that the teachings of the Sāṅkhya system are not in irreconcilable conflict with the doctrine of a personal God or with the Advaita Vedānta. The Mātharavṛtti on S. Kārikā 71 furnishes the names of certain teachers that flourished between Pañcaśikha and Īśvarakṛṣṇa viz. Bhārgava, Ulūka (Kauśika?), Vālmīki, Hārīta, Devala and others, while the Jayamaṅgalā mentions Garga and Gautama as Sāṅkhya teachers after Pañcaśikha (vide note one in Paṇḍit Aiyaswami's edition on p. 99). The Sanskrit commentary reconstructed from the Chinese version of Paramārtha (p. 98 of Pandit Aiyaswami's edition)

2211. सङ्कल्पमूलोच्छिन्नविषयसुगतृष्णो हि अयं यतिरिन्द्रियाणामन्तःकरणस्य च मध्वास्तिनिवृत्त्योरीहे। एकाग्र एकारामोऽविद्यापर्वणोऽतिक्रान्तः परस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रत्यनन्तरो भवति। p. 113; सोयं धर्मादिषु प्रवणस्तत्प्रतिपक्षापक्रान्तः सत्त्वारामो विनिवृत्ताभिमानो ज्ञाननिष्ठः सविद्युद्वयोनिरचिरेण परं ब्रह्मोपपद्यत इति। *p. 129.*

states that the line of teachers and pupils from Pañcaśikha is: Pañcaśikha–Gārgya–Ulūka–Vārṣagaṇa–Īśvarakṛṣṇa. It is clear from the above that several teachers, in any case not less than five or six, intervened between Pañcaśikha and Īśvarakṛṣṇa. From a somewhat mutilated passage[2212] of the Yuktidīpikā (p. 175) it appears that at least ten persons intervened between Pañcaśikha and Īśvarakṛṣṇa. If this be accepted and if Īśvarakṛṣṇa be assigned to about 250 A. D., then Pañcaśikha cannot be placed later than the first century B. C. and may be much earlier still. On 'tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram' (S. Kārikā 70) the Yuktidīpikā speaks of *bhagavat* Pāncaśikha as 'daśama-kumāra' (tenth son of Prajāpati?) and states that he expounded the śāstra to many persons such as Janaka and Vasiṣṭha and thereby identifies Pañcaśikha with the teacher Pañcaśikha mentioned by the Śāntiparva (vide note 2186 below).

Vācaspatimiśra in his commentary on the Yogasūtrabhāṣya (II. 23) sets out eight alternative views among Sāṅkhya writers on the question of 'darśana' and 'adarśana' and remarks that the fourth out of the eight alternatives is the real doctrine of the Sāṅkhyaśāstra.[2213] From about the 5th century A. D. the Sāṅkhyakārikā has been regarded as the standard work on the Sāṅkhya system. The S. Kārikā itself states that the holy śāstra was expounded by Kapilamuni to Āsuri, who expounded[2214] it to Pāñcaśikha and the latter expounded the (Sāṅkhya) system to several disciples and that it came down to Īśvarakṛṣṇa in a succession of teachers and disciples, who summarised it in Āryā

2212. अस्य तु शास्त्रस्य भगवतोऽग्रे प्रवृत्तत्वात् न शास्त्रान्तरवत् वंशः शक्यो वर्षसहस्रैरप्याख्यातुम्। संक्षेपेण तु इदं ... (gap) हारीत-बाद्धलि-कैरात- पौरिक-ऋषभेश्वर-पञ्चाधिकरण-पतञ्जलि-वार्षगण्य-कौण्डिण्य-मूकादिकशिष्यपरम्परयागतं etc. । युक्ति॰ p. 175.

2213. On 'इत्येते शास्त्रगता विकल्पाः' of व्यासभाष्य on योगसूत्र II. 23 वाचस्पति remarks: 'तदेवं विकल्प्य चतुर्थं विकल्पं स्वीकर्तुमितरेषां विकल्पानां सांख्यशास्त्रगतानां सर्वपुरुषसाधारण्येन भोगवैचित्र्याभावप्रसङ्गेन दूषयति इत्येते शास्त्रगता इति ।.'

2214. एतत्पवित्रमग्र्यं मुनिरासुरयेऽनुकम्पया प्रददौ। आसुरिरपि पञ्चशिखाय तेन च बहुधा कृतं तन्त्रम्॥ शिष्यपरम्परयागतमीश्वरकृष्णेन चैतदार्याभिः। संक्षिप्तमार्यमतिना सम्यग्विज्ञाय सिद्धान्तम्। सां. का. 70–71. It should be noticed that Gauḍapāda comments only on 69 verses and omits these two and a subsequent verse 'सप्तत्यां किल येऽर्थास्तेऽर्थाः कृत्स्नस्य षष्टितन्त्रस्य। आख्यायिकाविरहिताः परवादविवर्जिताश्चापि ॥', which means that all the matters contained in the whole Ṣaṣṭitantra (of Pañcaśikha) are contained in the seventy verses (of the Sāṅkhyakārikā), excluding the illustrative stories and the controversies with others. The Sāṅkhyakārikā is known as Sāṅkhyasaptati and in Chinese as 'Suvarṇasaptati.

verses. Kapila-muni is here said to be the first promulgator of the Sāṅkhya.

Before proceeding further the most characteristic and fundamental conceptions of the standard Sāṅkhya must be set out. The most fundamental conception is that there are two entirely distinct essences existing from eternity, viz. *prakṛti* (i. e. nature or matter) also called *pradhāna* and *avyakta*, and *puruṣa* (soul or spirit, the knowing subject). The 2nd fundamental conception is that puruṣas are many. Another most characteristic feature of the Sāṅkhya system is the doctrine of three [2215] guṇas (factors) called *sattva* (light, intelligent), *rajas* (energetic, active, domineering), *tamas* (coarse, inert, enveloping, dark). Pradhāna or prakṛti or avyakta is said to be constituted by the three guṇas (triguṇātmaka) when they are in equilibrium (Sattvarajastamasām sāmyāvasthā). The Sāṅkhya analysed all physical and mental phenomena. The lowest factor is the heavy impenetrable matter and coarse foolish impulses. They are called *tamas* (described as *guru*, heavy and *varaṇaka*, enveloping). Then there is the factor of constant change in the physical world as well as in the mental. This is called rajas (*cala*, changing and *upaṣṭambhaka*, exciting, as the S. Kārikā puts it). The third factor or element in the world is the varied operation of consciousness that leads to knowledge and experience, which is called *Sattva* (*laghu*, light as opposed to the coarse, merely material objects and *prakāśaka*, luminous, as contrasted with *tamas*). These three factors or elements combine in various proportions and make up the evolving universe. The three are called guṇas from several points of view viz. they are qualities, they also bind as with a rope the Puruṣa to *saṁsāra*. The basis of the universe is to be found in the guṇas. Pradhāna

---

2215. सत्त्वं लघु प्रकाशकमिष्टमुपष्टम्भकं चलं च रजः। गुरु वरणकमेव तमः प्रदीपवच्चार्थतो वृत्तिः॥ सां. का. 13. गुणs are so called because they multiply (गुणयन्तीति) and evolve objects. Compare 'मोहात्मकं तमस्तेषां रज एषां प्रवर्तकम्। प्रकाशबहुलत्वाच्च सत्त्वं ज्याय इहोच्यते॥ वनपर्व 212. 4 and गीता 14. 5–18 for a discourse on the three *guṇas*, *particularly the following* 'सत्त्वं रजस्तम इति गुणाः प्रकृतिसम्भवाः। V.5; तत्र सत्त्वं निर्मलत्वात् प्रकाशकमनामयम्। सुखसङ्गेन बध्नाति ज्ञानसङ्गेन चानघ। verse 6; रजो रागात्मकं विद्धि तृष्णासङ्गसमुद्भवम्। verse 7. On वे. सू. II. 2.10 शङ्कराचार्य notes that the Sāṅkhya system presented contradictions in the days of the V. S. 'परस्परविरुद्धश्चायं सांख्यानामभ्युपगमः। क्वचित्सप्तेन्द्रियाण्यनुक्रामन्ति क्वचिदेकादश। तथा क्वचिन्महतस्तन्मात्रसर्गमुपदिशन्ति क्वचिदहङ्कारात्। तथा क्वचित्त्रीण्यन्तःकरणानि वर्णयन्ति क्वचिदेकमिति।'. The seven indriyas would be the skin, five *karmendriyas and mind; the three antaḥkaraṇas would be buddhi, ahaṅkāra* and manas. The one antaḥkaraṇa would be buddhi.

is not different from the guṇas, but it is only the name of the primordial matter before evolution starts. Prakṛti being *anādi* and eternal, the Sāṅkhya system did not postulate God as creator, and held God to be a superfluity. The Sāṅkhya propounds a theory of cosmic evolution which is practically as reasonable as any modern theory of evolution. It is probably the earliest attempt to furnish an answer from reason alone to the questions about the origin of the world, about the nature of man and his relation to the physical world and man's future destiny. In the nineteenth century mind and matter were held to be entirely different and atoms were supposed to be indivisible. Modern physics has reduced matter to energy but the nature of this last also is a mystery. Under the Sāṅkhya system, *puruṣa* or *prakṛti* or both serve no religious purpose. There is no definite or convincing answer as to why puruṣa becomes entangled in the web of prakṛti. The Sāṅkhya simply says that as a result of non-discrimination puruṣa somehow becomes entangled. The Vedāntasūtra refers to *pradhāna* as smārta in I. 2. 19 and as 'ānumānika' in I. 4. 1. From Prakṛti evolves *mahān* (i. e. buddhi, consciousness) from which arises *ahaṅkara*, from which evolve on the one hand the five tanmātras (subtle elements, viz. sabda, sparśa, gandha, rasa, rūpa) and on the other hand *manas* (mind) and the ten *indriyas* (sense organs). From the five subtle elements are evolved the five great elements, earth, water, tejas, vāyu and ākāśa (ether). These are twentyfour[2216] *tattvas* (categories) and puruṣa is 25th. Pradhāna is distinct from puruṣa and serves the purpose of puruṣa (who is passive and a sākṣi) who is distinct from the evolutes of prakṛti and is *bhoktṛ* (and not *kartṛ*). The Sāṅkhya[2217] does not admit God. Prakṛti and puruṣa come together in order that the latter may see its working; just as a blind man and a cripple (a lame man) may come together (and the blind man may carry the lame man on his shoulder, the latter showing the way and both may reach their destination by this joint effort).[2218] When

2216. In V. S. I. 4. 11 the *pūrvapakṣa* is advanced as follows (after quoting Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 17 'yasmin pañca pañcajanā): तथा पञ्चविंशतिसंख्यया यावन्तः संख्येया आकाङ्क्ष्यन्ते तावन्त्येव च तत्त्वानि सांख्यैः संख्यायन्ते 'मूलप्रकृतिरविकृतिर्महदाद्याः प्रकृतिविकृतयः सप्त। षोडशकश्च विकारो न प्रकृतिर्न विकृतिः पुरुषः॥'. This last verse is सां. का. 3.

2217. The Sāṅkhya-pravacana-sūtra (I. 92-93) states 'ईश्वरासिद्धेः, मुक्तबद्धयोरन्यतराभावान्न तत्सिद्धिः।'.

2218. पुरुषस्य दर्शनार्थं कैवल्यार्थं तथा प्रधानस्य। पङ्ग्वन्धवदुभयोरपि संयोगस्तत्कृतः सर्गः। सां. का. 21. The sixty topics dealt with in the Ṣaṣṭitantra, according

(*Continued on next page*)

puruṣa realizes the difference between himself[2219] and the guṇas constituting Prakṛti he is liberated. Both Sāṅkhya and Yoga treat the external world as real. They both postulate plurality of souls (puruṣas), that are eternal and unchanging. This latter is one of the most crucial differences between Sāṅkhya and advaita Vedānta. It is not necessary for our purpose in this chapter to go into greater details. One more doctrine of the Sāṅkhya is called *satkāryavāda* i. e. the theory that the effect already exists in the cause and does not arise from nothing (S. Kārikā, verse 9); compare Chān. Up. VI. 2. 2 (kathamasataḥ sajjāyeta) and Gītā II. 16 (nāsato vidyate bhāvo).

It is difficult to assign a definite date to the Sāṅkhya-kārikā. As Paramārtha translated the Kārikā as well as commentary on it into Chinese in about 546 A. D. the Kārikā cannot in any case be placed later than about 250–300 A. D. It may be earlier by a few centuries. Umbeka in his commentary on the Ślokavārtika of Kumārila mentions an author called Mādhava as 'Sāṅkhyanāyaka' and Yuan Chwang also refers to a Sāṅkhya teacher called Mādhava. Dr. Raghavan in 'Sarūpa-Bhāratī' (pp. 162–164) shows that Mādhava was really a destructive critic of Sāṅkhya, that the proper reading is 'Sāṅkhyanāśaka-Mādhava' and that he was probably earlier than even Diṅnāga and Dharmarkīrti (*i.* e. earlier than 500 A. D.).

Śaṅkarācārya in the passage quoted in n. 2208 remarks that certain Upaniṣad passages may be relied upon as apparently supporting the Sāṅkhya system. Some of the Upaniṣad passages that either foreshadow Sāṅkhya doctrines or employ words that have technical meanings in the Sāṅkhya system would be

---

(Continued from last page)

to the युक्तिदीपिका p. 2 verses 10–12 and the राजवार्तिक quoted by Vācaspati in his commentary सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी, were: प्रधानास्तित्वमेकत्वमर्थवत्त्वमथान्यता। पारार्थ्यं च तथाऽनैक्यं वियोगो योग एव च। शेषवृत्तिरकर्तृत्वं मौलिकार्थाः स्मृता दश। विपर्ययः पञ्चविधस्तथोक्ता नव तुष्टयः। करणानामसामर्थ्यमष्टाविंशतिधा मतम्। इति षष्टिः पदार्थानामष्टभिः सह सिद्धिभिः॥ सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी ed. by Ganganatha Jha, Bombay, 1896). Vide सां. का. 47 *for the enumeration of* 50 topics (in addition to the ten basic ones in the verse प्रधानास्ति॰). The अहिर्बुध्न्यसंहिता in chap. XII. 20–29 sets out the sixty topics of Sāṅkhya-tantra, but they differ from those enumerated in the Rājavārtika quoted by Vācaspati.

2219. धर्मेण गमनमूर्ध्वं गमनमधस्ताद्भवत्यधर्मेण। ज्ञानेन चापवर्गो विपर्ययादिष्यते बन्धः। सां. कारिका। 44; compare गीता 14.18 'ऊर्ध्वं गच्छन्ति &c.' शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. I. 4. 4 states 'ज्ञेयत्वेन च सांख्यैः प्रधानं स्मर्यते गुणपुरुषान्तरज्ञानात्कैवल्यमिति वदद्भिः।'.

cited.[2220] But one passage from the Atharvaveda X. 8. 43 deserves notice, viz. 'the knowers of Brahma know that *yakṣa* endowed with ātman which abides in the lotus with nine gates (the physical body) covered by three guṇas.' With this may be compared Śv. Up. III. 18 and Gītā V. 13 (navadvāre pure dehī). The Muṇḍaka Up. states 'From Him are born prāṇa, mind, all indriyas, the five elements, and sky, wind, jyotis (tejas), waters and the earth.' The Kaṭha Up. refers to indriyas, the objects of senses, mind, buddhi, mahān, avyakta, puruṣa as a rising series, similar to that of the Sāṅkhya with one exception viz. the Up. does not mention *ahaṅkāra* and holds that *buddhi* and *mahān* are different, while the official Sāṅkhya identifies them. It is, therefore, clear that the evolution in these two Upanisads is very similar to the theory of evolution stated by the classical Sāṅkhya, the only difference being that the Upaniṣads postulate a supreme Creator (that produces the cosmos) while Sāṅkhya drops the creator and accepts the evolutionary series only. On V. S. I. 2. 12 Śankarācārya cites the verse 'dvā suparṇā sayujā' (which is Muṇḍaka Up. III. 1. 1, Śv. Up. III. 1 and also Ṛg. I. 164. 20) and explains it, as referring to the individual self (jīva) and the Highest Spirit (paramātman). The ācārya then mentions the argument of a predecessor who relies upon Paiṅgirahasya-brāhmaṇa where the latter half of the verse is explained as mentioning *sattva* (buddhi) and *kṣetrajña* (i. e. the individual self). This indicates that some took that verse as putting forward Sāṅkhya ideas. The Kaṭha Up. III. 4 states that the description of the individual soul as the enjoyer (bhoktṛ) results

2220. पुण्डरीकं नवद्वारं त्रिभिर्गुणेभिरावृतम्। तस्मिन्यद्यक्षमात्मन्वत् तद्वै ब्रह्मविदो विदुः॥ अथर्व० X. 8. 43. It is difficult to say what यक्ष here means. That word also occurs in Ṛg. IV. 3. 13, V. 10. 4, VII. 61. 5, where सायण gives different meanings. एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनः सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च। खं वायुर्ज्योतिरापः पृथिवी विश्वस्य धारिणी॥ मुण्डकोप० II. 1. 3; इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः। मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिर्बुद्धेरात्मा महान्परः॥ महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः। पुरुषान्न परं किंचित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः। कठोप. III. (valli) 10–11. These occur with slight variations in बृहद्योगियाज्ञवल्क्यस्मृति IX. 184–186. On V. S. I. 4. 1 the Sāṅkhya objector relies upon this Kaṭha text as providing evidence of the Sāṅkhya doctrines being based on the Veda; compare भगवद्गीता III. 42–43. Then शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. I.2 12 cites द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परिषस्वजाते। तयोरेकः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशीतीति॥ मुण्डक III.1.1, श्वेताश्वतरोप० IV. 6 and ऋ. I. 164.20) and states 'अपर आह। द्वा सुपर्णा – इति॥ नेयमृगस्याधिकरणस्य सिद्धान्तं भजते पैङ्गिरहस्यब्राह्मणेनान्यथा व्याख्यातत्वात्। तयोरेकः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्तीति सत्त्वम्, अनश्नन्नन्यो... अभिपश्यति ज्ञस्तावेतौ सत्त्वक्षेत्रज्ञौ।'. This verse (द्वा सुपर्णा) is the subject of V. S. III. 3. 34 *also*.

from the union of the *ātman* with organs of sense and the mind. The Śvetāśvataropaniṣad expressly [2221] refers to Sāṅkhya and Yoga (in VI. 13) and says that 'on realizing that cause which can be apprehended by means of the study of Sāṅkhya and Yoga he is released from all bonds'. That Upaniṣad is full of words that are frequently employed in the Sāṅkhya system such as 'avyakta' (I. 8), guṇa (V. 7 'sa viśvarūpas-triguṇaḥ' and VI. 2, 4 and 16), jña (v. 2, VI. 17), prakṛti ('māyām tu prakṛtim vidyāt' IV. 10), purusa (I. 2, III. 12, 13, IV. 7), pradhāna (I. 10, VI. 10 and 16), liṅga (I. 13, VI. 9). The Śv. Up. (VI. 11) describes the one God as 'sākṣī cetā kevalo nirguṇaś-ca'. The Sāṅkhya denies God and transfers these epithets to the Puruṣa, who in his true essence is, according to the Sāṅkhya, merely a passive witness, pure intelligence, unaffected by guṇas. The Praśna Up. (IV. 8) speaks of the five elements and their mātrās (pṛthivī ca pṛthivīmātrā ca &c), the ten *indriyas* and their objects, manas, buddhi, ahaṅkara &c. The Sāṅkhyas rely on the verse 'ajāmekām' (Śv. Up. IV. 5) [2222] for Upaniṣadic support to their theory about prakṛti and its three guṇas (vide bhāṣya of

---

2221. नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानामेको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान्। तत्कारणं सांख्ययोगाधिगम्यं ज्ञात्वा देवं मुच्यते सर्वपाशैः॥ श्वेताश्व० VI. 13. The first half occurs in कठोप. V. 130. शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू II. 1. 3 remarks 'यत्तु दर्शनमुक्तं तत्कारणं सांख्ययोगाभिपन्नम् इति, वैदिकमेव तत्त्वज्ञानं ध्यानं च सांख्ययोगशब्दाभ्यामभिलप्यते प्रत्यासत्तेरित्यवगन्तव्यम्॥'. Compare गीता 13. 19 and 21 प्रकृतिं पुरुषं चैव etc. for the relation of पुरुष, प्रकृति and गुण; साक्षी is explained ay Pāṇini as 'साक्षाद् द्रष्टरि संज्ञायाम्' V 2. 9. The word कैवल्य, the *snmmum bonum* of the Sāṅkhya, is derived from केवल (which word occurs in Śv. Up. I. 11 and VI. 11) and means केवलस्य भावः.

2222. अजामेकां लोहितशुक्लकृष्णां बह्वीः प्रजाः सृजमानां सरूपाः। अजो ह्येको जुषमाणोऽनुशेते जहात्येनां भुक्तभोगामजोऽन्यः॥ श्वेताश्व० उप. 4. 5. This verse metaphorically speaks of Prakṛti, Puruṣa and Guṇas acc. to the Sāṅkhya objector. अजा and अज ordinarily mean 'she-goat' and 'he-goat'. The words also mean 'unborn'. Therefore, *ajā* stands for Prakṛti and *aja* for Puruṣa, both of which are eternal acc. to the Sāṅkhya system. Lohita (red) stands for the guṇa *rajas*, śukla (white) for *sattvaguṇa* (which is *prakāśaka*) and kṛṣṇa (dark) for *tamas*. From Prakṛti are evolved numerous objects. The latter half refers to a soul that is enveloped in ignorance and therefore lives in bondage, but one who has realised the distinction between *guṇas* and *puruṣa* abandons *prakṛti* i. e. is liberated. The relations of the numerous puruṣas (poetically represented as he-goats) to the one Prakṛti (represented as a she-goat) are mentioned in this verse. These three colours really stand for three elements viz. *tejas*, *waters* and *food* (i. e. earth). Vide Chān. Up. VI. 3. 1 'यदग्ने रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्छुक्लं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्य.'

Śaṅkara on V. S. I. 4. 8). That verse means : there is one unborn (female), constituted by red, white and black, but producing manifold progeny resembling each other; there is one unborn being (a male) who resorts to her (loves her) and lies by her; there is another, who leaves her after having experienced enjoyment. Similarly, Sāṅkhyas argue that Kapila, the founder of the Sāṅkhya system, is mentioned in the Śv. Up. (V. 2) 'it is he who, in the beginning, bears (nourishes) by thoughts Kapila sage when born and looks on while he is being born.' If one looks to various passages of the Śv. Up. such as III. 4, IV. 12, VI. 18 one must hold that ṛsi Kapila,[2223] the reddish sage, is Hiranyagarbha (the golden child), the first creation (Hiraṇyagarbhaḥ samavartatāgre,' Rg. X. 121. 1). Śankarācārya (on V. S. II. 1. 1) replies that from the mere occurrence of the word 'Kapila' one cannot at once jump to the conclusion that he must be the founder of the Sānkhya, since another Kapila, called Vāsudeva, who reduced to ashes the sons of Sagara by his angry look, is well-known.[2224] Śaṅkarācārya concedes on V. S. II. 1. 3 that both Sāṅkhya and Yoga are within the pale of Vedic orthodoxy as regards those portions of them that are not in conflict with the Veda. The five elements (mahābhutāni) are mentioned in the Ait. Up. (III. 3), Praśna VI. 4 and the five special qualities of these five in Kaṭha Up. (III. 15).

In view of the fact that the word 'Sāṅkhya' occurs in the Śv. Up. and that the Kaṭha and Muṇḍaka have some doctrines similar to the Sāṅkhya system and the Śvetāśvatara employs many words that occur frequently in the works on Sāṅkhya, the question arises—what is the relation of the Sāṅkhya to the Upaniṣads. There are three possible views, (1) that Upaniṣad thought and Sāṅkhya made parallel progress, (2) that Sāṅkhya adopted and expanded some of the germinal ideas

---

2223. या तु श्रुतिः कपिलस्य ज्ञानातिशयं प्रदर्शयन्ती प्रदर्शिता न तया श्रुतिविरुद्धमपि कापिलं मतं श्रद्धातुं शक्यं कपिलमिति श्रुतिसामान्यमात्रत्वात्। अन्यस्य च कपिलस्य सगरपुत्राणां प्रतप्तुर्वासुदेवनाम्नः स्मरणात्। भाष्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 1; येन त्वंशेन न विरुध्येते तेनेष्टमेव सांख्ययोगस्मृत्योः सावकाशत्वम्। शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 3.

2224. In the Viṣṇupurāṇa IV. 4. 12 Kapila is said to be a part of bhagavān Puruṣottama, who reduced to ashes the 60 thousand sons of Sagara, that suspected that the Aśvamedha horse grazing near that sage must have been stolen by him (IV. 4. 16–23). For Vāsudeva Kapila, vide Vanaparva 107. 31–33, where we read (in Chitraśālā ed.) 'ततः क्रुद्धो महाराज कपिलो मुनिसत्तमः। वासुदेवेति यं प्राहुः कपिलं मुनिपुङ्गवम्। ... ददाह सुमहातेजा मन्दबुद्धीन् स सागरान्।'. The story is also mentioned in Vanaparva 47 (7–18).

of the Upaniṣads, (3) that some Upaniṣads borrowed from the Sāṅkhya. It is not possible to discuss these questions here for reasons of space and relevance. The present author holds that it is the Sāṅkhya that based itself on the thoughts of the Upaniṣads, particularly when the older Upaniṣads like the Bṛ. Up. and Chāndogya hardly exhibit any traces of Sāṅkhya doctrines or technique, when Sāṅkhya references are found only in Kaṭha, Muṇḍaka, Śvetāśvatara, Praśna (which are held to be later than Chān. Up. and Bṛ. Up. by modern scholarship) and when there is hardly any work or writer of purely Sāṅkhya doctrines that can be assigned to a period even a few centuries earlier than the Christian era and when no one can place the principal Upaniṣads (about twelve, including the Svetāśvatara) later than 300 B. C., since even the Śv. Up. is referred to as 'Śruti' in V. S. I. 4. 8, II. 3. 22. Garbe (in 'Die Sāṅkhya Philosophie' pp. 3 ff) denies that Sāṅkhya underwent any essential modifications in its long history. Jacobi does not agree, holding that Sāṅkhya originated out of a common cultural and philosophical heritage and Oldenberg sees the origin of Sāṅkhya in the Kaṭha and Śv. Up. and holds that epic Sāṅkhya is an independent development ('Die Lehre der Upanishaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus', 1915, pp. 206 ff). Sāṅkhya and Yoga were known to Kauṭilya (Sāṅkhyam Yogo Lokāyatam cetyānvīkṣikī' Arthaśāstrā I. 2. p. 6.). Therefore, we may say that Sāṅkhya as a philosophical school started at least before the 4th century B. C.

We should now turn to Sanskrit works other than the Upaniṣads for seeing the origins of the Sāṅkhya system. First comes the Mahābhārata.

In many passages of the Śāntiparva [2225] references to some of the doctrines, technical words and persons connected with the mature Sāṅkhya system occur. The references are so many that the present writer will have to select only a few passages by way of sample. In chap. 203 there is a dialogue between a clever pupil and his guru. It begins by stating (in verse 8) that Vāsudeva is all this (Vāsudevaḥ sarvam-idam), then it proceeds 'just as from one lamp thousands of lamps can proceed, so prakṛti

2225. For the Śāntiparva only the critical edition of the Mahābhārata issued by the BORI is cited in this section on Sāṅkhya from this paragraph onwards. The quotations from other parvans are taken from the Citraśālā Press edition.

creates endless things, but does not become reduced (in size) thereby; buddhi springs from the activity of avyakta (i.e. prakṛti) and ahankāra is produced (from buddhi) and from ahankāra is evolved *ākāśa* from which *vāyu* arises and then *tejas*, water and the earth arise each from its predecessor; these eight are the mūlaprakṛtis[2226] and the whole world is centred in them (verses 24-26). Then the chap. mentions five organs of knowledge (ear, skin, eye, tongue, sense of smell) and five senses of activity (hands &c) and then there are the five objects of sense (viz. śabda, sparśa &c) and the mind is all-pervading and the 16th (verses 27-31). Then the chapter speaks of puruṣa (the soul) that resides in the city with nine[2227] gates and is undecaying and immortal, which shines in all beings just as a lamp, whether big or small, does. In chapter 204 the same dialogue is pursued and the first verse says all *bhūtas* spring from *avyakta* and are merged (die) in *avyakta*, it refers to *kṣetra* (the body) and *kṣetrajña* (in verse 14) and winds up by saying that, just as seeds burnt by fire do not grow, the soul is not again connected with *kleśas*[2228] when they are burnt by the fire of (correct) knowledge. In chap. 205, verses 22-23 speak of the characteristics of the three guṇas; chap. 206 says that when a person brings under control anger, avarice,[2229] fear, pride and becomes pure he merges into the highest self that is Viṣṇu in *avyakta* form and chap. 207 deals with the measures for reaching the highest goal and puts forward brahmacarya (sexual purity) as

---

2226. मूलप्रकृतयोऽष्टौ ता जगदेतास्ववस्थितम्॥ ज्ञानेन्द्रियाण्यतः पञ्च पञ्च कर्मेन्द्रियाण्यपि। विषयाः पञ्च चैकं च विकारे षोडशं मनः॥ verses 26-27. Compare सांख्यकारिका 3 q. above in n 2216 for षोडशकश्च विकारः etc.

2227. नवद्वारं पुरं पुण्यमेतैर्भावैः समन्वितम्। व्याप्य शेते महानात्मा तस्मात्पुरुष उच्यते॥ शान्ति 203. 35. Compare also भगवद्गीता 'नवद्वारे पुरे देही नैव कुर्वन् न कारयन्'. The word पुरुष is generally derived as पुरि शेते इति पुरुषः. Vide निरुक्त I. 13 यथा चापि प्रतीतार्थानि स्युस्तथैतान्याचक्षीरन् पुरुषं पुरिशय इत्याचक्षीरन्; but in II. 3 it gives three derivations of 'पुरुषः पुरिषादः पुरिशयः पूरयतेर्वा' (the first being पुरि+ष from सद् to sit). The derivation of the word from पुरि शेते occurs ever in the बृह. उप. II. 4. 18 'स वा अयं पुरुषः सर्वासु पूर्षु पुरिशयः'. The words नवद्वारे पुरे देही occur in श्वेताश्व० III. 18.

2228. क्लेश is a technical term in the Yogasūtra where it occurs frequently as in I 24, II. 2 and 3, II. 12, IV. 28 and 30. Yogasūtra II. 3 enumerates the five *kleśas* as अविद्या-अस्मिता-राग-द्वेष-अभिनिवेशाः क्लेशाः'. They are so called because they harass man (क्लिश्यन्ति पुरुषम्).

2229. क्रोधलोभौ भयं दर्पं एतेषां साधनाच्छुचिः॥ परमं परमात्मानं देवमक्षयमव्ययम्। विष्णुमव्यक्तसंस्थानं विशन्ते देवसत्तमम्' chap. 206. 1-2.

the first measure. In these chapters, though some doctrines peculiar to the standard Sāṅkhya of the Kārikā appear, they are all brought in line with the Vedānta of one supreme Being, which is negatived in the official Sāṅkhya.

That there were philosophers, who adopted some of the Sāṅkhya and Yoga doctrines, postulated Parameśvara (Supreme Deity) and held that the three, viz. Pradhāna, Puruṣa and Īśvara were different from each other, is expressly stated by Śaṅkarācārya[2230] in his bhāṣya on V. S. II. 2. 37. Therefore, the Mahābhārata references to Sāṅkhya probably relate to philosophical doctrines in which all three viz. Prakṛti, Puruṣas and Supreme Self were recognized, from which arose the later official Sāṅkhya that discarded any supreme Ruler of the Universe. In the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śāntiparva (quoted in note 1544 p. 954 above) 'Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Pāñcarātra, Vedas and Pāśupata are said to be knowledges (jñānāni) and 'nānāmatāni' (different points of view) and Kapila, a paramarṣi, is said to be propounder of Sāṅkhya. Chapter 294 (in verses 26-49) deals with the twenty-five tattvas of the Sāṅkhya from Prakṛti or Avyakta, mahat, ahaṅkāra, the five elements from ahaṅkāra (these eight being called prakṛtis) and then 16 *vikāras* (verse 29). These are called *kṣetra*, the soul is the 25th (v. 35) and is called kṣetrajña and Puruṣa (v. 37 'avyaktake pure śete puruṣaś-ceti kathyate', and Īśvara or *brahma* is not brought in anywhere in that chapter.

Chapters 211–212 (containing in all 100 verses) of Śāntiparva deal with what Janaka, called Janadeva,[2231] king of Mithilā, learnt from Pañcaśikha, when the latter, after wandering over the whole earth, visited Mithilā and who is described as the first (or foremost) pupil of Āsuri and who is said to have performed a sattra for a thousand years on Pañcasrotas[2232]

2230. तस्मात् प्रकृतिराधिष्ठाता केवलं निमित्तकारणमीश्वर इत्येष पक्षो वेदान्तविहितब्रह्मैकत्वप्रतिपक्षत्वाद्यत्नेनात्र प्रतिषिध्यते। सा चेयं वेदबाह्येश्वरकल्पनानेकप्रकारा। केचित्तत्सांख्ययोगव्यपाश्रयाः कल्पयन्ति प्रधानपुरुषयोरधिष्ठाता केवलं निमित्तकारणमीश्वर इतरेतरविलक्षणाः प्रधानपुरुषेश्वरा इति। शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. II. 2. 37 (पत्युरसामञ्जस्यात्).

2231. Janadeva may be a proper name of Janaka and may mean 'Lord of men' (i. e. same as 'Janādhipa') In the Bṛhan-Nāradīya-purāṇa I. chap. 45 the same story about Janaka and Pañcaśikha is narrated often in the words of the Śāntiparva.

2232. Pañcaśrotas probably means 'Pañcanada' (the five rivers of the Punjab). Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. p. 787. The cr. ed. of the Śāntiparva

(*Continued on next page*)

(verse 10). He was the son of a brāhmaṇa woman called Kapilā and was therefore known as Kāpileya (verses 13–15). Janaka had a hundred ācāryas in his palace who propounded the different views of different sects. Verse 9 says that Pañcaśikha made people wonder when he appeared like Kapila, the great sage (paramarṣi) and Prajāpati, that he confounded the hundred ācāryas by his arguments (v. 17). Later Janaka abandoned those ācāryas and followed Pañcaśikha (verse 18). He, after creating disgust in Janaka about his caste or about rites and about everything, expounded to Janaka the highest *mokṣa* which is declared as Sāṅkhya. In chāp. 212 Pañcaśikha expounds five elements, five jñānendriyas, five karmendriyas, mind (verses 7–22) and the signs (*liṅgas*) of sāttvika, rājasa and tāmasa bhāvas (verses 25–28) and describes how a person who seeks the Self is freed from the fetters of pleasure and pain and being beyond the fear of old age and death reaches immortality. In the first place, these two chapters are not sometimes very clear, offer no consistent clear-cut system and employ words that are difficult to construe and are not completely identical with the scheme of the 25 tattvas of the official Sāṅkhya of the Kārikā, since chap. 211 verse 13 speaks of 'ekākṣara brahma assuming many forms'. For example, it is difficult to say what is meant by 'puruṣāvastham-avyaktam'. The meaning that can be drawn out of the words seems to be 'he (Pañcaśikha) conveyed knowledge (to Janaka) about Avyakta (i. e. Pradhāna) that depends upon Puruṣa (i. e. that becomes active through union of Puruṣa with it), which is the highest truth. It further says that Pañcaśikha became perfect (in knowledge) by the performance of *iṣṭis* and *sattras*, again by abounding tapas, had a vision of the deity (God) and he realized the distinction between kṣetra and kṣetrajña and also realized *brahma* symbolized[2233] by om. There-

(*Continued from last page*)

omits one verse in chap. 211 (corresponding to chap. 218 of the Citraśālā Press ed.), which is पञ्चस्रोतसि निष्णातः पञ्चरात्रविशारदः । पञ्चज्ञः पञ्चकृत्पञ्चगुणः पञ्चशिखः स्मृतः ॥ which is 11–12 in that chap. Here पञ्चशिख is said to have been profoundly learned in पञ्चरात्र (वैष्णव) doctrines. As he was called कापिलेय, it was probably imagined that his mother was Kapilā.

2233. तं समासीनमागम्य मण्डलं कापिलं महत् । पुरुषावस्थमव्यक्तं परमार्थं न्यवेदयत् ॥ इष्टिसत्रेण संसिद्धो भूयश्च तपसा मुनिः । क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोर्व्यक्तिं बुबुधे देवदर्शनः ॥ यत्तदेकाक्षरं ब्रह्म नानारूपं प्रदृश्यते । शान्ति 211. 11–13, पुरुषावस्थं must be dissolved (in order that some sense can be made out of it) as पुरुषे अवस्था (अवस्थानं यस्य) or 'पुरुषे अवतिष्ठते इति.' The meaning of मण्डलं कापिलं महत् is not at all clear,

(*Continued on next page*)

fore, the doctrine of Pañcaśikha in these chapters of Śāntiparva is really *advaita* (monism) on which are grafted some doctrines similar to the later official Sāṅkhya for explaining creation and so forth.[2234] In Śāntiparva 306. 56–66 (= Chitra ed. 318. 58–62) Viśvāvasu tells Yājñavalkya that he has heard about the 25th tattva (i. e. Puruṣa) from Jaigīṣavya, Asita-Devala, Vārṣagaṇya (of Parāśara gotra), Bhṛgu Pañcaśikha, Kapila, Śuka, Gotama Ārṣṭiṣeṇa, Garga, Nārada, Āsuri, Pulastya, Sanatkumāra, Śukra and Kaśyapa (father of Viśvāvasu) and 336. 65 (Chitra. ed. 318. 67) states that Yājñavalkya had mastered completely both Sāṅkhya and Yoga. Śāntiparva 304. 4 (=316. 4 of Citra. ed.) states that Sāṅkhya and Yoga are one.[2235]

Pañcaśikha figures frequently in the Mahābhārata. In Śāntiparva, chap. 307 (containing only 14 verses) Yudhiṣṭhira asks Bhīṣma how one can rise superior to old age and death,

---

(Continued from last page)

but from the passages in the Ahirbudhnya-saṁhitā, chap. XII. 18–29 it follows that the doctrines of Kapila's Sāṅkhya—tantra were divided into two maṇḍalas called Prākṛta and Vaikṛta and the two had 32 and 28 topics respectively. 'सांख्यरूपेण सङ्कल्पो वैष्णवः कपिलादृषेः। उदितो यादृशः पूर्वं तादृशं शृणु मेऽखिलम्। षष्टिभेदं स्मृतं तन्त्रं सांख्यं नाम महामुने। प्राकृतं वैकृतं चेति मण्डले द्वे समासतः ॥'. The com. Arjunamiśra appears to take it as 'the great doctrine of Kapila came to him (Pañcaśikha) in the form of an aura of light and expounded to him the highest truth' etc. This is extremely far-fetched. There is a doubt about the agent of 'nyabodhayat and as to whom 'samāsīnam' refers. To me it appears that the meaning is that 'Pañcaśikha came to him (i. e. to Janaka) and imparted to him the great Kāpila maṇḍala, the highest truth, the avyakta etc.' According to the usual sanskrit construction the agent of 'āgamya' and 'nyabodhayat' must be the same (i. e. Pañcaśikha). समासीनं refers to जनक. Compare 'एकाक्षरं परं ब्रह्म' मनु II. 83 and 'ओमित्येकाक्षरं ब्रह्म व्याहरन् मामनुस्मरन्' गीता VIII. 13. Verse 13 of chap. 211 is आसुरिर्मण्डले तस्मिन् प्रतिपेदे तदव्ययम्। (अव्ययं refers to एकाक्षर-ब्रह्म). Therefore, मण्डल should be taken to mean 'the circle of the doctrines first propounded by Kapila.'

2234. The position reached by Janaka on Pañcasikha's teaching is stated in Śānti 212. 50–51. 'न खलु मम तुषोऽपि दह्यतेऽत्र स्वयमिदमाह किल स्म भूमिपालः। इदममृतपदं विदेहराजः स्वयमिह पञ्चशिखेन भाष्यमाणः॥. Compare शान्ति 171. 56 अनन्तं बत मे वित्तं यस्य मे नास्ति किंचन॥ मिथिलायां प्रदीप्तायां न मे दह्यति किंचन॥ धम्मपद 200, उत्तराध्ययनसूत्र 9. 14 सुहं वसामो जीवामो जेसि मो णत्थि किंचण। मिहिलाए डज्झमाणीए न मे डज्झइ किंचण॥. इमां तु यो वेद विमोक्षबुद्धिमात्मानमन्विच्छति चाप्रमत्तः। न लिप्यते कर्मफलैरनिष्टैः पत्रं बिसस्येव जलेन सिक्तम्॥ शान्ति 212–44; vide note 1640, pp. 1005–6 above for the figure of a lotus leaf and water falling thereon.

2235. यदेव योगाः पश्यन्ति तत्सांख्यैरपि दृश्यते। एकं सांख्यं च योगं च यः पश्यति स पश्यति।.

whether by very great tapas[2236] or by rites or by Vedic learning or by the use of *rasāyanas* (elixirs of life or alchemist's prescriptions). Bhīṣma speaks of an ancient dialogue between Janaka and Bhikṣu Pañcaśikha, where the same question was put by Janaka and Pañcaśikha replied that none can escape these two and that union with wife and relatives is like meeting persons when on a journey (i. e. the company of these is not durable or permanent), nobody has seen heaven or hell, that one's duty is not to violate the ordinances of Vedas, and to make gifts and to offer sacrifices. In this chapter there is hardly anything which approaches the special doctrines of the Sāṅkhya, though Pañcaśikha's views are here set forth. Chap. 308 (191 verses out of which less than 30 have anything to do with Pañcaśikha's teachings directly) begins with the question of Yudhiṣṭhira 'who secured mokṣa without giving up the stage of householder.' Then Bhīṣma narrates to him the dialogue between Janaka called Dharmadhvaja[2237] and Sulabhā, a nun. Janaka was learned in the Veda, in mokṣaśāstra and in his own śāstra (rājadharma), he had controlled his senses and ruled the earth. She heard from ascetics about Janaka's righteous conduct and she desired to find out the truth. She gave up her form as a nun by her yogic powers and became a woman, a paragon of beauty, and met Janaka. The latter informed her that he was the pupil of old bhikṣu[2238] Pañcaśikha of the Pārāśarya gotra who stayed with him during the four months of the rainy season and who expounded to him the threefold mokṣa (viz. Sāṅkhya, Yoga and the science of government) and yet who did not ask him to give up rulership. Janaka said

---

2236. तपसा वा सुमहता कर्मणा वा श्रुतेन वा। रसायनप्रयोगैर्वा कैर्नापैति जरान्तकौ ॥ ... केन वृत्तेन भगवन्नतिक्रामेज्जरान्तकौ। तपसा वाथ बुद्ध्या वा कर्मणा वा श्रुतेन वा॥ शान्ति 307. 2 and 5.

2237. 'Dharmadhvaja' may be a proper name here; if not, it means 'one who has raised aloft the banner of dharma' i. e. who proclaims to the world that he follows dharma in all matters.

2238. पाराशर्यसगोत्रस्य वृद्धस्य सुमहात्मनः। भिक्षोः पञ्चशिखस्याहं शिष्यः परमसंमतः॥ सांख्यज्ञाने तथा योगे महीपालविधौ तथा। त्रिविधे मोक्षधर्मेऽस्मिन् गताध्वा छिन्नसंशयः॥ तेनाहं सांख्यमुख्येन सुदृष्टार्थेन तत्त्वतः। श्रावितस्त्रिविधं मोक्षं न च राज्याद्विचालितः॥ सोऽहं तां निखिलां वृत्तिं त्रिविधां मोक्षसंहिताम्। मुक्तरागश्चराम्येकः पदे परमके स्थितः॥ वैराग्यं पुनरेतस्य मोक्षस्य परमो विधिः। ज्ञानादेव च वैराग्यं जायते येन मुच्यते॥ शान्ति 308. 24-29. A conjecture may be hazarded that this Pañcaśikha is entirely different from the Pañcaśikha who was one of the founders of the Sāṅkhya and that he is probably the same as the Pārāśarya who is credited by Pāṇini as having composed a 'bhikṣusūtra', 'पाराशर्यशिलालिभ्यां भिक्षुनटसूत्रयोः' पा. IV. 3. 110; Vide note 1901 p. 1169 above.

"I, giving up all attachment, though occupying the highest position (as ruler), follow the three paths of *mokṣa*; the highest rule of this mokṣa is 'freedom from attachment, the absence of attachment is due to correct knowledge whereby one is freed from bondage (of saṁsāra)". Janaka further avows that[2239] on account of the knowledge imparted to him by the bhikṣu who is called after his top-knot, he is free from all attachment, though looking after the kingdom and that he is different from other sannyāsins. Then Janaka gives in verses (308. 38–41) another meaning[2240] of the threefold Mokṣa propounded by Pañcaśikha to him viz. (1) highest knowledge and renunciation of actions, (2) strict adherence to the patha of *karma* (duties prescribed by Śāstra) and (3) combination of knowledge and actions, and it is said that those who follow this third path resemble householders in several respects. Janaka asserts his view 'wearing ochre-coloured[2241] garments, shaving the head, carrying a water-vessel placed on three staves-these are merely outward signs and do not lead to *mokṣa* and that *mokṣa* does not consist in non-possession of wealth and bondage does not follow possession of some wealth, but it is *jñāna* by which a person secures deliverance, whether there is possession or non-possession of wealth'. It appears from verse 40 that Pañcaśikha emphasized the third kind of Mokṣaniṣṭhā (Jñānakarmasamuccaya) and Janaka followed that teaching. The rest of the chapter (308) is concerned with Janaka's charges against Sulabhā and Sulabhā's scathing remarks against Janaka.[2242] She says at the end 'you

---

2239. तद्भगवता तेन शिखाप्रोक्तेन भिक्षुणा। ज्ञानं कृतमबीजं मे विषयेषु न जायते॥... मुक्तसङ्गः स्थितो राज्ये विशिष्टोऽन्यैस्त्रिदण्डिभिः॥ Chap. 308. 34–37. पञ्चशिख literally means 'one having five śikhās (locks of hair on the head)'. Therefore, he is referred to as शिखाप्रोक्त (lit. declared by his śikhās).

2240. लोके हि त्रिविधा निष्ठा दृष्टा पूर्वैर्महर्षिभिः। ज्ञानं लोकोत्तरं यत्र सर्वत्यागश्च कर्मणाम्॥ ज्ञाननिष्ठां वदन्त्येके मोक्षशास्त्रविदो जनाः। कर्मनिष्ठां तथैवान्ये यतयः सूक्ष्मदर्शिनः। प्रहायोभयमप्येतत् ज्ञानं कर्म च केवलम्। तृतीयेयं समाख्याता निष्ठा तेन महात्मना॥ 308. 38–40.

2241. काषायधारणं मौण्ड्यं त्रिविष्टब्धः कमण्डलुः। लिङ्गान्यत्यर्थमेतानि न मोक्षायेति मे मतिः॥ ... आकिंचन्ये न मोक्षोऽस्ति कैञ्चन्ये नास्ति बन्धनम्। कैञ्चन्ये चेतरे चैव जन्तुर्ज्ञानेन मुच्यते॥ Chap. 308. 47 and 50. अकिंचन means one who possesses nothing and अकैञ्चन्य means 'the state of being अकिञ्चन'. Should we read अत्यार्थम् or अर्थार्थम् for अत्यर्थम् as some mss. do? The verses are chap. 320. 47 ff of चित्र॰ ed.

2242. Some of her telling retorts are set out here. 'यथात्मनि परस्मिंश्च समतामध्यवस्यसि॥ अथ मां कासि कस्येति किमर्थमनुपृच्छसि। ... सर्वः स्वे स्वे गृहे राजा सर्वः

(*Continued on next page*)

have indeed heard from Pañcaśikha the whole (doctrine) about mokṣa together with the means (for attaining it), with the Upaniṣad passages expounding it or with the auxiliaries (of meditation) and with definite conclusions.'

This passage expressly refers to Upaniṣads in connection with mokṣa and the preceding verses emphasize the freedom from attachment on the part of Janaka (in 308. 37 'mukta-saṅga'). The Bṛ. Up. in III. 1 refers to the sacrifice performed by Janaka, king of Videha, who set apart a thousand cows to be given to him from among the brāhmaṇas assembled at it, that would be the most profound in learning and be *brahmiṣṭha* (most learned in or devoted to brahma). Yājñavalkya asked his disciple to take the cows away; thereupon followed a learned disquisition by questions (of angry brāhmaṇas including a woman) and answers by Yājñavalkya;[2242] the questioners were Aśvala (the holy priest of Janaka), Jāratkārava Ārtabhāga, Bhujyu Lāhyāyani, Uṣasta Cākrāyaṇa, Kahola Kauṣītakeya, Gargī Vācaknavī, Uddālaka, Āruṇi, Vidagdha Śākalya (III. 1-9 ending with 'vijñānam-ānandam brahma)'. In Bṛ. Up. IV. 2 it is said that Janaka Vaideha approached Yājñavalkya, did obeisance to him and said 'instruct me' and that then the sage spoke to him 'you have studied the Veda and the Upaniṣads have been expounded to you by ācāryas, but, when you will be leaving this body, where will yo go'? Janaka replied that he did not know it and requested the sage to enlighten him on that point. Then a long disquition follows (Bṛ. Up. IV. 2 ff) in which occurs the famous passage ('sa eṣa neti netyātmā, agṛhyo na hi gṛhyate ...... asaṅgo na hi sajjate ...... abhayam vai Janaka prāptosi' (IV. 2. 4). It appears to the present writer that some one desirous of boosting Sāṅkhya teachings inserted the chapters about Sāṅkhya in which Pañcaśikha is substituted in place of Yājñavalkya as the teacher of Janaka.

It would be seen from the brief synopsis of the chapters 211-12, 307 and 308 that the views described in all of them are not the same as those of the official or standard Sāṅkhya, that Pañcaśikha's views as presented in chapters 211-212 seem to be different from those in chap. 308, particularly when chap. 308 emphasizes that jñāna-karma-samuccaya was the view of

---

(*Continued from last page*)

स्वे स्वे गृहे गृही। विग्रहानुग्रहौ कुर्वस्तुल्यो जनक राजभिः॥ 308. 126-27, 147. ननु नाम त्वया मोक्षः कृत्स्नः पञ्चशिखाच्छ्रुतः। सोपायः सोपनिषदः सोपासङ्गः सनिश्चयः॥ chap. 308. 163. The Com. Nilakaṇṭha explains: उपासङ्गो ध्यानाङ्गानि यमादीनि.

Pañcaśikha, while the official Sāṅkhya holds that jñāna alone leads to liberation. It should be noted that these chapters nowhere refer to a work of Pañcaśikha but show him to be a wandering ascetic holding certain views. The present writer believes that the author of these passages in the Śāntiparva had no work before him and only knew by hearsay and tradition that Pañcaśikha was a great Sāṅkhya teacher. Prof. Keith holds that the Pañcaśikha of the Śāntiparva is not identical with Pañcaśikha, the author of Ṣaṣṭitantra (p. 48 of 'Sāṅkhya System'). [2243]

There are other chapters in the Śāntiparva where the peculiar Sāṅkhya doctrines and terminology are employed but they are brought in line with Vāsudeva or Highest Self to which the Sāṅkhya doctrines are made subordinate. For example, in chap. 340 Nārada is said to have been [2244] told by God himself some of the tenets of Sāṅkhya such as the twenty-four tattvas and Puruṣa as the 25th tattva, the three guṇas, that Puruṣa is kṣetrajña and bhoktṛ, that ācāryas, who have arrived at definite conclusions about Sāṅkhya, call God who is in the orb of the Sun as Kapila, that Hiraṇyagarbha, who is well praised in the Veda and is announced as (author) of Yogaśāstra, is 'myself'.

Not only in the Śāntiparva, but also in other *parvans* of the Mahābhārata, Sāṅkhya doctrines are dwelt upon. For example, the Āśvamedhika (in chap. 35. 47–48) speaks of sattva, rajas, tamas as ātmaguṇas and mentions their equilibrium. In another place, the same parvan enumerates the 24 *tattvas* viz. avyakta, mahān, ahaṅkāra &c and describes the three guṇas. [2245]

2243. Vide p. 11 (note) of Hall's Preface to the edition of Sāṅkhya-pravacanasūtra (1856), where passages ascribed to Pañcaśikha are grouped together and Richard Garbe in Festgruss an Rudolph von Roth (Stuttgart, 1893) pp. 75–80 for fragments of Pañcaśikha.

2244. द्विर्द्वादशेभ्यस्तत्त्वेभ्यः ख्यातो यः पञ्चविंशकः। पुरुषो निष्क्रियश्चैव ज्ञानदृश्यश्च कथ्यते॥ यं प्रविश्य भवन्तीह मुक्ता वै द्विजसत्तम। स वासुदेवो विज्ञेयः परमात्मा सनातनः॥ ... सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्चैव गुणानेतान्प्रचक्षते। एते सर्वशरीरेषु तिष्ठन्ति विचरन्ति च। एतान्गुणांस्तु क्षेत्रज्ञो भुंक्ते नैभिः स भुज्यते॥ ... विद्या सहायवन्तं मामादित्यस्थं सनातनम्। कपिलं प्राहुराचार्याः सांख्यनिश्चितनिश्चयाः॥ हिरण्यगर्भो भगवानेष छन्दसि सुष्टुतः। सोऽहं योगगतिर्ब्रह्मन् योग-शास्त्रेषु शब्दितः॥ शान्ति॰ 340. 23, 24, 26–27, 64–65. हिरण्यगर्भ is praised in the hymn Ṛg. X. 121. 1 and appears to be identified with Prajāpati in the last verse of the hymn (X. 121. 10 Prajāpate na tvadetānyanyo). The शान्तिपर्व chap. 340 corresponds to chap. 339 of the Chitrashala edition and the verses quoted here all occur in that chap.

2245. सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्चेति त्रय आत्मगुणाः स्मृताः। तेषां गुणानां साम्यं चेत्तदाहुः स्वस्थलक्षणम्। तेषामन्यतमोत्सेके विधानमुपदिश्यते॥ आश्वमे॰ 12. 4–5; compare शान्ति-

(*Continued on next page*)

Āsuri is mentioned by the S. Kārikā as the pupil of Kapila, also in a quotation in Yogasūtrabhāṣya on I. 25 (note 2251) and by the Śāntiparva (chap. 306). But no work is attributed to him and hardly any quotation from him is cited by writers on Sāṅkhya (except a verse quoted as his by Haribhadra a late Jain writer). Kapila is a legendary figure. In Ṛgveda X. 27. 16 Kapila[2246] is mentioned as one among ten (Aṅgirases) whom, though similar to them, they (Aṅgirases) urge on for a sacrifice. Vide Hall's Preface to Sāṅkhya-pravacanabhāṣya (ed. 1856) pp. 14 ff for the confused legends about Kapila. Some references to Kapila in the Mahābhārata have already been noted. In Vanaparva (221. 26) Kapila is styled as the promulgator of Sāṅkhya-yoga, as Paramarṣi and as an incarnation of Agni. In the Matsyapurāṇa[2247] it is stated that water should be offered to the seven sons of Brahmā, viz. Sanaka, Sananda, Sanātana, Kapila, Āsuri, Voḍhu and Pañcaśikha. The Vāmana-purāṇa (60. 70) mentions Kapila (as knower of Sāṅkhya), Voḍhu, Āsuri, Pañcaśikha (as 'yogayukta') and states that Sanatkumāra approached Brahmā for yoga lore.

In the Snānasūtra of Kātyāyana (kaṇḍikā 3) attached to the Pāraskaragṛhyasūtra the above seven are the only persons to whom *tarpaṇa* is offered among *ṛṣis* (vide II. of Dh. vol. II.

(Continued from last page)

पर्व 16. 11-13. Guṇas in the Sāṅkhya system must be understood to be of the nature of both substance and qualities. Vide also तमो रजस्तथा सत्त्वं गुणानेतान् प्रचक्षते। अन्योन्यमिथुनाः सर्वे तथान्योन्यानुजीविनः॥ तमसो मिथुनं सत्त्वं सत्त्वस्य मिथुनं रजः। रजसश्चापि सत्त्वं स्यात्सत्त्वस्य मिथुनं तमः॥ आश्वमे. 36. 4 and 6. Vide chap. 36. 12-15 for तामसगुणs and 17-20 for तामसवृत्त and chap. 37 for राजसगुणवृत्त and 38. 1-9 for सत्त्वगुणs.

2246. दशानामेकं कपिलं समानं तं हिन्वन्ति क्रतवे पार्याय। गर्भं माता सुधितं वक्षणास्ववेनन्तं तुषयन्ती बिभर्ति॥ ऋ. X. 27. 16. The latter half is mystical and not clear.

2247. मनुष्यांस्तर्पयेद्भक्त्या ब्रह्मपुत्रानृषींस्तथा। सनकश्च सनन्दश्च तृतीयश्च सनातनः। कपिलश्चासुरिश्चैव वोढुः पञ्चशिखस्तथा। सर्वे ते तृप्तिमायान्तु मद्दत्तेनाम्बुना सदा॥ मत्स्य० 102. 17-18. The Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa (IV. 2. 272-274) mentions these seven sons of Brahmā but in a different order. The वामनपुराण (60. 69-70) mentions the seven sons as सनत्कुमार, सनातन, सनक, सनन्दन, कपिल, वोढु and आसुरि and adds पञ्चशिख. In the बृहद्योगियाज्ञवल्क्यस्मृति (VII. 66) these same seven are said to be human sons of Brahmā. The स्मृतिच. I. p. 193 quotes मत्स्य 102. 14-21 on the topic of तर्पण, but reads 'कपिलश्चासुरिश्चैव सोढुः पञ्चशिखस्तथा।' in verse 18. वोढु or वोढ is a strange name and no verse or prose passage of his has been cited in works and commentaries on Sāṅkhya. It looks more like a prakrit form of some Sanskrit word. Vide Garbe in 'Die Sāṅkhya Philosophie' p. 72 for Voḍhu,

p. 693). In the Bhāgavatapurāṇa (I. 3. 10) Kapila is said to be the 5th avatāra of Viṣṇu, is called *siddheśa* (the lord of siddhas) and the teacher of Āsuri in Sāṅkhya that had become decadent (by lapse of time). The Gītā also (X. 26 'siddhānām Kapilo muniḥ') mentions Kapila as a *muni* and the most eminent among siddhas. The S. Kārikā also refers to him as muni. The Kūrmapurāṇa (II. 7. 7) echoes the very words of the Gītā ('siddhānām Kapilo muniḥ').

In the *vaṁśas* in Bṛ. Up. II. 6. 3 and VI. 5. 2–3, in which succession lists of teachers and pupils differing from one another occur, Āsuri is said to be disciple of Bharadvāja in the first and the pupil of Yājñavalkya in the second. Each list contains at least 60 teachers from Brahmā downwards. In the first place, it is difficult to hold that these lists are authentic and there is no evidence to establish that the Āsuri mentioned in both is the same as the pupil of Kapila.

Pañcaśikha's is a great name in the Sāṅkhya system. His systematic work on that system was called Śaṣṭitantra. The S. Kārikā (70, 72) refers to him as the author of the Śaṣṭitantra containing great details, illustrative tales and discussions of others' views. It was called Ṣaṣṭitantra because it expounded sixty topics and it contained sixty thousand gāthās.[2248] The Yogasūtrabhāṣya (IV. 13) quotes a verse which is ascribed to Ṣaṣṭitantra by Vācaspati on Yogasūtrabhāṣya IV. 13. The present writer cannot agree with Keith p. 69 that the reference to Ṣaṣṭitantra in S. Kārikā (verse 72) is not to a work but to a philosophy of sixty topics. The āryā 72 had a Sanskrit commentary which was translated into Chinese in 546 A. D. in which it was stated that the work contained six thousand *gāthās*,[2249] but the Bhāmatī (by Vācaspati) on V. S. II. 1. 3 ascribes it to Vārṣagaṇya. It may be a slip on the part of Vācaspati or it is possible that he regarded Pañcaśikha and Vārṣagaṇya as the names of the same person, the first being a nickname and the latter a gotra name. On Yogasūtra I. 4, 25, 36, II. 5, 6, 13, 17,

---

2248. अयं पञ्चशिखः षष्टिसहस्रगाथात्मकं विपुलं तन्त्रमुक्तवान्। p. 97 of Pandit Aiyaswami's ed.; षष्टिपदार्था यस्मिन् शास्त्रे तन्त्र्यन्ते व्युत्पाद्यन्ते तत् षष्टितन्त्रम्। माठरवृत्ति.

2249. 'Gāthā' here seems to mean 'a group of 32 syllables or a fixed number of mātrās as a unit.' The few quotations attributed to Pañcaśikha are almost all in prose, only one under Y. S. IV. 13 being in verse and later commentators like Bhāvā-Gaṇeśa on Sāṅkhya-sūtra quote verses of Pañcaśikha.

18, 20, III. 13 and 41, IV. 13 (tathā ca śāstrānuśāsanam 'Guṇānām &c), prose passages occur which Vācaspati ascribes to Pañcaśikha. On S. Kārikā 2 Vācaspati quotes in his com. the view of Pañcaśikhācārya. In Yogasūtrabhāṣya on I. 25 a sūtra is quoted which Vācaspati ascribes to Pañcaśikha in which Kapila is styled 'ādividvān' (the first master of Sāṅkhya) and 'paramarṣi' and is said to have imparted to Āsuri the Tantra, the Sāṅkhya Siddhānta.

In the dialogue between Viśvāvasu Gandharva and Yājñavalkya (in Śāntiparva, chap. 306) there is a long list of sages from whom Viśvāvasu says he learnt a great deal (in verses 56–60) but prays to Yājñavalkya[2250] that the latter should expound to him the knowledge of Sāṅkhya and Yoga (verses 65–66). Then Yājñavalkya states that *prakṛti* is also called pradhāna, that it does not know the 25th (viz. the puruṣa) and that there is a 26th (Highest Self) and so on. That list contains the following names: *Jaigīṣavya*,[2251] Asita, Devala, *Vārṣagaṇya* of the Parāśaragotra, *bhikṣu Pañcaśikha*, *Kapila*, Śuka, Gautama, Ārṣṭiṣeṇa, Gārgya, Nārada, *Āsuri*, Pulastya, Sanatkumāra, Śukra, father of Kaśyapa. The sages are not mentioned in chronological order. Five of them (that are in Italics) are important so far as Sāṅkhya and Yoga are concerned. We saw above that Pañcaśikha is said to be of Parāśara gotra and in the above list Vārṣagaṇya also is said to be of the same gotra. Vācaspati on S. Kārikā 47 ascribes to Vārṣagaṇya the view that *avidyā* has five facets or aspects.[2252] The Yogasūtrabhāṣya on III. 53 quotes a sūtra of Vārṣagaṇya. It is shown above from

---

2250. तथा च शास्त्रानुशासनम्। गुणानां परमं रूपं न दृष्टिपथमृच्छति। यत्तु दृष्टिपथं प्राप्तं तन्मायेव सुतुच्छकम्। इति। योगसूत्रभाष्य IV. 13; अत्रैव षष्टितन्त्रशास्त्रस्यानुशिष्टिः। मायेव न तु माया। सुतुच्छकं विनाशि। तत्त्ववैशारदी on योगसूत्र; अत एव योगशास्त्रं व्युत्पादयिता ह स्म भगवान् वार्षगण्यः। गुणानां ... सुतुच्छकम्। भामती on वे. सू. II. 1. 3.

2251. यथाह स्म भगवान् पञ्चशिखाचार्यः–स्वल्पसङ्करः सपरिहारः सप्रत्यवमर्षः–इति। on अविशुद्धि in सां. कारिका 2; तथा चोक्तम्। आदिविद्वान्निर्माणचित्तमधिष्ठाय कारुण्याद्भगवान् परमर्षिरासुरये जिज्ञासमानाय तन्त्रं प्रोवाचेति। योगसूत्रभाष्य I. 25; तथा चोक्तं पञ्चशिखाचार्येण। आदिविद्वान् कपिल इति। वाचस्पति's टीका.

2252. पञ्च विपर्ययभेदा भवन्त्यशक्तिश्च करणवैकल्यात्। सां. कारिका 47; 'अविद्या-अस्मिता-राग-द्वेष-अभिनिवेशाः ... पञ्च विपर्ययविशेषाः। ... पञ्चपर्वा अविद्येत्याह भगवान् वार्षगण्यः। सां. तत्त्वकौमुदी of वाचस्पति; बुद्धचरित (of अश्वघोष) XII. 33 is: इत्यविद्या हि विद्वांसः पञ्चपर्वा समीहते। तमो मोहं महामोहं तामिस्रद्वयमेव च॥. The श्वेताश्व० उप. I. 5 has the words 'पञ्चाशद्भेदां पञ्चपर्वामधीमः'. In the Kūrmapurāṇa (II. 11. 129) Kapila is said to have given instruction to both Jaigīṣavya and Pañcaśikha. It is difficult to say whether that Purāṇa had before it any ancient tradition to this effect.

the reconstruction of the Sanskrit Com. from Chinese that Vārṣagaṇa was one of the teachers after Pañcaśikha and before Īśvarakṛṣṇa. So it is extremely doubtful if Pañcaśikha and Vārṣagaṇya are identical. Vide JRAS for 1905 pp. 33–53 (by Takakusu who shows on p. 47 that Vṛṣagaṇa was a teacher of Vindhyavāsa and that Vasubandhu wrote a work called Paramārthasaptati in opposition to Vindhyavāsa and that Paramārtha was in China from 546 to 569 A. D.

In the Introduction to the Uttarādhyayana-sūtra (a Jain work) Charpentier refers to two different lists one older and shorter which speaks of the four Vedas, Itihāsas (as 5th), Nighaṇṭu as the sixth and of the Vedic aṅgas and upāṅgas and then of Ṣaṣṭitantra. This last may be a reference to Pañcaśikha's work or simply to the 60 topics dwelt upon in the Sāṅkhya system.

In Śāntiparva (chap. 222) Yudhiṣṭhira asks Bhīṣma: by what character, conduct, lores and by being intent on what does a person reach the abode of Brahmā which is higher (or beyond) *prakṛti* and Bhīṣma mentions the dialogue of Jaigīṣavya and Asita Devala in which it is stated that he who is unperturbed by being reviled or praised, who keeps silent over his good deeds, does not harm even him who harms him, is always calm and does good to all beings, reaches the abode of Brahmā. The Buddhacarita (XII. 67) speaks of Jaigīṣavya, Janaka and Vṛddha-Parāśara as having secured mokṣa by the path described in that chapter. The Yogabhāṣya (on III. 18) gives a long story about Āvaṭya (called prince of Yogins) and Jaigīṣavya. Jaigīṣavya is quoted in Vyāsabhāsya on Y. S. II. 55 for *indriya-jaya* (control over senses). He appears to be a Vedāntic writer on Yoga.

Not only does the Śāntiparva dilate upon some of the peculiar doctrines associated with the later official doctrines of the S. Kārikā, but the Bhagavadgītā also does so. A few striking passages are cited here. Gītā XIII. 5 (Mahābhūtānyahaṅkāro buddhiravyaktam eva ca । Indriyāṇi daśaikam ca pañca cendriyagocarāḥ ॥) enumerates the twenty-four tattvas omitting puruṣa and mentioning the five elements in place of the five tanmātrās); XIII. 19–20 (prakṛtim puruṣam caiva viddhyanādī ubhāvapi । vikārāṁśca guṇāṁścaiva viddhi prakṛtisambhavān ॥ Karyakāraṇa-kartṛtve hetuḥ prakṛtir-ucyate । Puruṣaḥ sukhduḥkhānām bhoktṛtve heturucyate ॥); XIV. 5–9 (sattvam rajas tama iti guṇāh prakṛtisambhavāḥ &c.); VII. 4

(bhūmirāpoॆnalo vāyuḥ kham mano buddhireva ca । ahaṅkāra itīyam me bhinnā prakṛtir-aṣṭadhā ॥), VII. 13, II. 28. The Gītā in VII. 6 and 8 emphatically states that God is the source of the whole world, which ultimately is merged in Him. Herein the Gītā differs materially from the standard Sāṅkhya. The Gītā expressly mentions "Sāṅkhya-kṛtānta"[2253] (i. e. siddhānta) in XVIII. 13; what that means is that by that time Sāṅkhya tenets had assumed the form of a system but there is no express or definite reference to a work such as in the case of Veda or Vedānta (in XV. 15) or Brahmasūtra (in XIII. 4).

Vindhyavāsa or Vindhyavāsin (dweller on Vindhya mountain) is identified with Īśvarakṛṣṇa by Takakusu in B. E. F. E. O. for 1904 p. 48 and by Keith on pp. 73–79 in 'Sāṅkhya System.' His view about the non-existence of the *ātivāhika* body after a man's death is mentioned by Kumārila.[2254] Dr. B. Bhattacharya (in J. I. H. vol. VI. pp. 36–49) goes into the question of the identity of Vindhyavāsa with Īśvarakṛṣṇa. The present writer agrees with him but he does not agree with his further conclusion (p. 49) that Vindhyavāsa lived earlier than Īśvarakṛṣṇa whom he assigns to the period 330–390 A. D. The evidence is too meagre to prove this. In JRAS for 1905 pp. 47 ff. Vindhyavāsa is said by Takakusu to be a pupil of Vṛṣagaṇa and that according to Paramārtha Vṛṣagaṇa and Vindhyavāsa lived in the 10th century after Buddha's nirvāṇa. From Kamalaśīla (p. 22 of Tattva-saṅgraha) it appears that Rudrila was also a name of Vindhyavāsa.

The Abhinavabhāratī of Abhinavagupta distinguishes between the two;[2255] so it is possible that Vindyavāsa only revised the

---

2253. Vide p. 954 note 1545 above where the five Siddhāntas (Kṛtānta-pañcaka) are Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Pañcarātra, Śaiva and Pāśupata.

2254. अन्तराभवदेहस्तु निषिद्धो विन्ध्यवासिना । तदस्तित्वे प्रमाणं हि न किंचिदवगम्यते ॥ श्लोकवार्तिक, आत्मवाद verse 62 p. 704 on which the com. Nyāyaratnākara explains: 'यद्यपि आतिवाहिकं नाम शरीरं पूर्वोत्तरदेहयोरन्तराले ज्ञानसन्तानसन्धारणार्थं कल्प्यते तदपि विन्ध्यवासिना निराकृतमित्यादि'. While criticizing the Sāṅkhya and its 'Satkāryavāda' कमलशील makes fun of the epithet Vindhyavāsin (which may also suggest 'a man who belongs to a wild tribe on the Vindhya mountain) applied to Rudrila 'यदेव दधि तत् क्षीरं यत्क्षीरं तद्दधीति च । वदता रुद्रिलेनैव ख्यापिता विन्ध्यवासिता ॥'.

2255. On नाट्यशास्त्र (22. 88–89, G. O. S. vol. III. p. 184 मनसश्चिविधो भावः) it is said by Abhinavagupta 'कापिलदृशि तु विन्ध्यवासिनो मनस एव ईश्वरकृष्णादिमते मनःशब्देनात्र बुद्धिः ।'. मेधातिथि on मनु I. 55 remarks "कैश्चिदिष्यते अस्त्यन्यदन्तराभवं शरीरं यस्येयमुत्क्रान्तिः । ... सांख्या अपि केचिदन्तराभवमिच्छन्ति विन्ध्यवासप्रभृतयः ।". Vide सां. का. 39–41 for the intermediate subtle body.

Sāṅkhya system after Īśvarakṛṣṇa. Bhojadeva in his Rājamārtaṇḍa [2256] on Yogasūtra IV. 22 (23 of most editions) 'dṛṣṭi-dṛśyoparaktam cittam sarvārtham' quotes a prose passage from Vindhyavāsin. As there is no evidence to show that Īśvarakṛṣṇa composed some work other than the Sāṅkhyakārikā, Vindhyavāsin must be treated as different from Īśvarakṛṣṇa according to Bhojadeva. The Yuktidīpikā several times mentions the views of Vindhyavāsin and indicates that he is different from the author of the S. Kārikā. Vide pp. 4, 108, 144, 148. This work says that the ācārya (author of S. Kārikā) did not enumerate *jijñāsā* [2257] and other constituents of the Śāstra but other ācāryas like Vindhyavāsa did mention them in other treatises. On pp. 144–145 this com. shows that Vindhyavāsin held that *indriyas* were *vibhu* (all-pervading), denied the existence of a subtle body (sūkṣma śarīra), while in S. Kārikā (40–41) Īśvarakṛṣṇa held that the *indriyas* were not *vibhu* and that there was a *liṅga* or sūkṣma body and Yuktidīpikā p. 144 says that Patañjali postulated a subtle body.

How the name Sāñkhya came to be applied to a system of philosophy has to be considered. 'Saṅkhyā' means 'number', hence enumeration. As the Saṅkhya system enumerated twenty-five tattvas and as the Ṣaṣṭitantra of Pañcaśikha dealt with sixty topics, it is likely that the philosophy came to be called Sāṅkhya. The Śv. Up. I. 4 is full of numbers.[2258] Verse I. 5 of Śv. Up. employs the word pañca (five) seven times and also has the word 'pañcāśadbhedām', similar to 'śatārdhāram' in I. 4); vide VI. 3 also. In this sense Sāṅkhya means the

---

2256. स एव भोगोऽत्यन्तसंनिधानेन विवेकाग्रहणादभोक्तुरपि पुरुषस्य भोग इति व्यपदिश्यते। अनेनैवाभिप्रायेण विन्ध्यवासिनोक्तं 'सत्त्वतप्यत्वमेव पुरुषतप्यत्वम्'। भोजदेव on यो. सू. IV. 22.

2257. एवं चेन्मन्यसे सन्ति जिज्ञासादयोऽवयवाः शास्त्रे तेषामनुपदेशे प्रयोजनं वक्तव्यम्। अमुष्माद्धेतोराचार्येण नोपदिश्यन्ते सन्ति च त इति। उच्यते प्रमाणान्तर्भावात्। ... तन्त्रान्तरेषु विन्ध्यवासिप्रभृतिभिराचार्यैरुपदिष्टाः प्रमाणं नस्ते आचार्या इत्यतश्चानुपदेशो जिज्ञासादीनामिति। युक्तिदीपिका. p. 4; विन्ध्यवासिनस्तु विभुत्वादिन्द्रियाणां बीजदेशे वृत्त्या जन्म तत्त्यागो मरणम्। तस्मान्नास्ति सूक्ष्मशरीरम्। तस्मान्निर्विशेषः संसार इति पक्षः। ... तस्मान्न करणानां विभुत्वमुपपद्यते। तस्मात्-चित्रं यथाश्रयमृते स्थाण्वादिभ्यो विना यथा छाया। तद्वद्विना विशेषैर्न तिष्ठति निराश्रयं लिङ्गम्॥ (कारिका ४१) pp. 144–145.

2258. तमेकनेमिं त्रिवृतं षोडशान्तं शतार्धारं विंशतिप्रत्यराभिः। अष्टकैः षड्भिर्विश्वरूपैकपाशं त्रिमार्गभेदं द्विनिमित्तैकमोहम्॥ श्वेता. उप. I. 4. शतार्धारं means 'having fifty spokes.' The सां. का. (46–47) refers to 50 *bhedas* of Buddhisarga. There are eight basic elements viz. Prakṛti, mahat, ahaṅkāra and five *tanmātrās*. 'सांख्यं संख्यात्मकत्वाच्च कपिलादिभिरुच्यते।' मत्स्य. III. 29. Vide also शान्ति० 294. 41.

philosophic system which postulates twentyfive tattvas, Prakṛti, Puruṣa and others. This is the sense in which the word is used once even in the Gītā (18. 13, Sāṅkhya kṛtānte proktāni &c). The Matsyapurāṇa also emphasizes this aspect of the Sāṅkhya system.

The word 'Saṅkhyā' has another sense as the Amarakośa states ('carcā saṅkhyā vicāraṇā) viz. 'rational examination' or 'discernment'; and the word Sāṅkhya may be derived from it in the sense of 'system of rational examination' and in the sense of 'philosopher' (masculine) according to 'tadadhīte tadveda' (Pāṇ. IV. 2. 59) meaning 'Sāṅkhyam veda'.[2259] The Bhāmatī explains the word in the second sense. Sāṅkhya in a general sense means tattvajñāna (knowledge of ultimate reality, including Vedānta) or a 'person who knows the ultimate reality.' The word Sāṅkhya is frequently used in the Bhagavadgītā in the sense of *tattvajñāna* (as in II. 39, V. 5, XIII. 24) and in the sense of a person knowing ultimate reality (in III. 3, V. 5).

Some comparatively early Sanskrit works that disclose tenets similar to the standard Sāṅkhya of the Kārikā may be briefly noticed here. The Buddhacarita of Aśvaghoṣa (in chap. XIII. 17ff) mentions a dialogue between Arāḍa and Gautama (the future Buddha) in which occur *prakṛti*, five elements, *ahaṅkāra*, buddhi, the indriyas, objects of sense, mind, kṣetrajña as Ātman and states that Kapila with his pupil was enlightened as to these; that nescience, actions and desires are the causes of saṁsāra; that *avidyā* has five aspects (verses 33–37) which are defined, speaks of *brahmacarya*, and *mukti*. Though the tattvas are mentioned here the rest of the doctrines bear very little resemblance to the official Sāṅkhya.

The Carakasaṁhitā[2260] (Jamnagar ed. 1949), Śārīrasthāna chap. I (particularly verses 17, 36, 63–66) contains some doctrines similar to the Sāṅkhyakārikā scheme and verse 151

2259. 'संख्या सम्यग्बुद्धिर्वैदिकी तया वर्तन्ते इति सांख्याः' भामती on वे. सू. भाष्य II. 1. 3.

2260. पुनश्च धातुभेदेन चातुर्विंशतिकः स्मृतः। मनो दशेन्द्रियाण्यर्थाः प्रकृतिश्चाष्टधातुकी॥ ... रजस्तमोभ्यां युक्तस्य संयोगोऽयमनन्तवान्। ताभ्यां निराकृताभ्यां तु सत्त्ववृद्ध्या निवर्तते॥ ... खादीनि बुद्धिरव्यक्तमहङ्कारस्तथाष्टमः। भूतप्रकृतिरुद्दिष्टा विकाराश्चैव षोडश। बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि पञ्चैव पञ्च कर्मेन्द्रियाणि च। समनस्काश्च पञ्चार्था विकारा इति संज्ञिताः॥ जायते बुद्धिरव्यक्ताद्बुद्ध्याहमिति मन्यते। परं खादीन्यहङ्कारादुत्पद्यन्ते यथाक्रमम्॥...अतःपरं ब्रह्मभूतो भूतात्मा नोपलभ्यते। निःसृतस्सर्वभावेभ्यश्चिह्नं यस्य न विद्यते। ज्ञानं ब्रह्मविदां चात्र नाज्ञस्तज्ज्ञातुमर्हति। चरक (शारीरस्थान chap. 1. verses 17, 36. 63–64, 66, 155.

refers to Yogins and Sāṅkhyas and ultimately the liberated soul is said to become *brahma*. Therefore, it is more like the philosophy of Kaṭha and Śv. Upaniṣads.

The Suśrutasaṁhitā also (in Śārīrasthāna, chap. I paragraphs 3, 4–6, 8–9) sets out the Sāṅkhya,[2261] is much closer to the standard system of the Kārikā than either the Buddhacarita or the Carakasaṁhitā as the quotations in the notes will show.

From p. 1352 and note 2208 above it would be seen that the tenet of *pradhāna* being the cause of the world was mentioned in their works by Manu and others. This will be briefly illustrated. Manu I. 15 in speaking of creation mentions mahān, the three guṇas, objects of sense, five senses. Manu I. 27 refers to the five *tanmātrās* of the five elements. In Manusmṛti XII. 24 *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* occur as the three guṇas, verses 26–29 define and illustrate these three and XII. 30-38 dilate upon the different effects of the three guṇas and the indications about these guṇas; XII. 40 provides that those who rest in *sattva-guṇa* become gods, those who are *rājasa* become men and those that abide in *tamas* become lower animals.[2262] Manu XII. 50 speaks of mahān and avyakta. Yāj. smṛti (III. 91–92) speaks of the five objects of sense, five jñānendriyas, five karmendriyas and mind (16 in all); these sixteen together with ahaṅkāra, buddhi and five elements, kṣetrajña and Īśvara are mentioned in Yāj. III. 177–178 and verses 179–180 set out the evolution of *buddhi* from *avyakta*, of ahaṅkāra from buddhi, of tanmātrās from ahaṅkāra, the five guṇas (śabda, sparśa &c.) of the five elements and verse 182 speaks of the three guṇas.

2261. सर्वभूतानां कारणमकारणं सत्त्वरजस्तमोलक्षणमष्टरूपमखिलस्य जगतः सम्भवहेतुरव्यक्तं नाम। तदेकं बहूनां क्षेत्रज्ञानामधिष्ठानं समुद्र इवौदकानां भावानाम्। सुश्रुत° I. 3; तस्मादव्यक्तान्महानुत्पद्यते तल्लिङ्ग एव तल्लिङ्गाच्च महतस्तल्लक्षण एवाहङ्कार उत्पद्यते स त्रिविधो वैकारिकस्तैजसो भूतादिरिति। सुश्रुत I. 4; तत्र बुद्धीन्द्रियाणां शब्दादयो विषयाः कर्मेन्द्रियाणां वचनादानानन्दविसर्गविहरणानि। सुश्रुत I. 5; अव्यक्तं महानहङ्कारः पञ्च तन्मात्राणि चेत्यष्टौ प्रकृतयः, शेषाः षोडश विकाराः I. 6; तत्र सर्व एवाचेतन एष वर्गः, पुरुषः पञ्चविंशतितमः कार्यकारणसंयुक्तश्चेतयिता भवति। सत्यप्यचैतन्ये प्रधानस्य पुरुषकैवल्यार्थं प्रवृत्तिमुपदिशन्ति क्षीरादींश्चात्र हेतूनुदाहरन्ति। I. 8; compare with this last सां. कारिका 57 'वत्सविवृद्धिनिमित्तं क्षीरस्य यथा प्रवृत्तिरज्ञस्य। पुरुषविमोक्षनिमित्तं तथा प्रवृत्तिः प्रधानस्य॥'.

2262. बुद्धेरुत्पत्तिरव्यक्तात्ततोहङ्कारसम्भवः। तन्मात्रादीन्यहङ्कारादेकोत्तरगुणानि च॥ याज्ञ. III. 179; compare सत्त्वं ज्ञानं तमोऽज्ञानं रागद्वेषौ रजः स्मृतम्। मनु XII. 26 with सां. का. 13 सत्त्वं लघु q. above p. 1357 and गीता 14. 6–8, या. III. 137–140.

On p. 1352 and in note 2208 above occurs the statement of Śaṅkarācārya that Devala, a Sūtrakāra on Dharma, accepted Sāṅkhya doctrines. This will be briefly indicated here. Aparārka on Yāj. III. 109 quotes a very long passage[2263] from Devala, which after stating that there are two goals of human life (purusārtha) viz. *abhyudaya* and *niḥśreyasa* and that the latter comprises Sāṅkhya and Yoga, defines Sāṅkhya as the knowledge of twenty-five tattvas, and yoga as the fixing of the mind on the desired goal after turning it away from objects of sense, and

---

2263. On the word योगशास्त्रं in याज्ञ. III. 109 अपरार्क quotes a long passage (all in prose except one verse) from Devala, almost the whole of which is set out here. देवमानुषयोर्द्विविधः पुरुषार्थः, अभ्युदयो निःश्रेयसमिति । तयोरभ्युदयः पूर्वोक्तः । द्विविधं निःश्रेयसं सांख्ययोगाविति । पञ्चविंशतितत्त्वज्ञानं सांख्यम् । विषयेभ्यो निवर्त्याभिप्रेतेऽर्थे मनसोऽवस्थापनं योगः । उभयत्रापवर्गः फलम् । जन्ममरणदुःखयोरत्यन्ताभावोऽपवर्गः । एतौ सांख्ययोगौ चाधिकृत्य यैर्युक्तित. समयतश्च पूर्वप्रणीतानि विशालानि गम्भीराणि तन्त्राणीह संक्षिप्योद्देशतो वक्ष्यन्ते । तत्र सांख्यानामेका मूलप्रकृतिः । सप्त प्रकृतिविकृतयः । पञ्च तन्मात्राणि षोडश विकाराः पञ्च पञ्चेन्द्रियाणि । अर्थाञ्च (अर्थाश्च?) पञ्चभूतविशेषाः । त्रयोदश करणानि त्रीण्यन्तःकरणानि । चतस्रश्चतस्रो मातृजाः पितृजाश्च कोशाः । पञ्च वायुविशेषाः । त्रयो गुणाः । त्रिविधो बन्धः । त्रयो बन्धनहेतवः । द्वौ बन्धरागौ । त्रीणि प्रमाणानि । त्रिविधं दुःखम् । चतुर्विधः प्रत्ययवर्गः । तथा द्विविधः सर्गः । तथा विपर्ययः पञ्चविधः । अशक्तिरष्टाविंशतिधा तुष्टिर्नवविधा । सिद्धिरष्टविधेति प्रत्ययभेदाः पञ्चाशत् ।

> अस्तित्वमेकत्वमथार्थवत्त्वं परार्थमन्यत्वमथो निवृत्तिः ।
> योगो वियोगो बहवः पुमांसः स्थितिः शरीरस्य च शेषवृत्तिः ॥

इति दशमूलिकार्थाः । अथ मूलप्रकृतिरव्यक्ता (क्तं?) महानहङ्कारः पञ्च तन्मात्राणीति प्रकृतिविकृतयः । शब्दतन्मात्रं स्पर्श°, रस°, रूप°, गन्धतन्मात्रमिति तन्मात्राणि । द्विविधानीन्द्रियाणि । भूतविशेषाश्च विकाराः । चक्षुःश्रोत्रघ्राणजिह्वात्वचो बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि । रूपशब्दगन्धरसस्पर्शास्तेषामर्थाः । वाक्पाणिपादपायूपस्थाः कर्मेन्द्रियाणि:भाषणं क्रिया गमनमुत्सर्ग आनन्द एषां कर्माणि । वाय्वग्न्यब्आकाशपृथिव्यो भूतविशेषाः । दशेन्द्रियाणि बुद्ध्यहंकारमनांसि च करणानि । तेषु मनोबुद्ध्यहङ्काराश्चान्तःकरणानि । दश बहिःकरणानीन्द्रियाणि च । गुणसाम्यलक्षणमव्यक्तं प्रधानं प्रकृतिर्विधानमित्यनर्थान्तरम् । अध्यवसायलक्षणो महान् बुद्धिर्मतिरुपलब्धिरित्यनर्थान्तरम् । अभिमानलक्षणोऽहङ्कारो वैकारिकोऽभिमान इत्यनर्थान्तरम् । न पूर्वपूर्विका प्रकृतिः । प्रकृतेर्महानुत्पद्यते ततोऽहङ्कारः । अहङ्कारात्तन्मात्राणीन्द्रियाणि च । तन्मात्रेभ्यो विशेषा इत्युत्पत्तिक्रमः । यो यस्मादुत्पद्यते स तस्मिंल्लीयत इति वाप्ययं क्रमः (चाप्ययक्रमः) । अपरार्क pp. 986-988 on या III. 109. For अभ्युदय and निःश्रेयस vide p. 1037 n. 1671 above. Compare pp. 1358-59 note 2218 (verse प्रधानास्तित्वमेकत्वं etc.) with the verse अस्तित्वमेकत्व ... शेषवृत्तिः of this passage. On p. 100 of Pandit Aiyaswami's edition the verse अस्तित्व ... शरीरस्य विशेषवृत्तिः is restored from Chinese. The तत्त्वसमास-सूत्रवृत्ति p. 135 (Chow S.S.) reads 'न्यत्वमकर्तृता च'. On p. 165 of कृत्यकल्पतरु (मोक्षकाण्ड) the portion देवमनुष्ययोः द्विविधः पुरुषार्थः ... वर्गः फलम् is again quoted from देवल; on p. 124 of the same work देवल in prose is again quoted for three *bandhas* (Prakritibandha, Vaikārikabandha and Dakṣiṇābandha) and for three bandhanahetus. On the same page three verses and a half are quoted from Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa for the three bandhas (Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa, Venk. Edition IV. 3. 37-40).

states that the fruit of both is *apavarga* which means the total disappearance of the sufferings of birth and death. The quotation then proceeds to say that there are extensive and profound tantras concerning both Sāṅkhya and Yoga composed by former (sages) relying on ratiocination and tradition and these will be summarized and their subjects set out. As to the Sāṅkhyas there are these : *mūlaprakṛti*, seven categories that are both prakṛtis and vikṛtis, five tanmātrās, sixteen vikāras (products); indriyas are five (jñānedriyas) and five (karmendriyas), five objects of sense, five elements; thirteen *karaṇas*, three being antaḥkaraṇas; viparyaya of five kinds, *aśakti* of 28 kinds; *tuṣṭi* of nine kinds, *siddhis* of eight kinds; in this way there are 50 pratyayabhedas, there are ten basic matters, viz. astitva (existence of prakṛti &c). After this there is again an enumeration of prakṛti, avyakta, mahān, ahaṅkāra, five tanmātrās &c.

It would be noticed that the quotation from Devala in Aparārka contains two parts, the first stopping at the words 'iti daśa mūlikārthāḥ' and the 2nd containing the rest. It appears that the two parts cover mostly the same ground and it is probable that the two parts are summaries of two different works on Sāṅkhya.

Another important digest of the first quarter of the 12th century A. D. namely the Kṛtyakalpataru of Lakṣmīdhara in its Mokṣakāṇḍa pp. 100–101 also quotes from Devala's Dharmasūtra a prose passage which agrees word for word with a portion of the passage quoted above from Aparārka viz. from the words 'tatra sāṅkhyānām ekā mūlaprakṛtiḥ' up to 'trīṇyantaḥ-karaṇāni'. Then the portion from 'catasraś-catasro' to 'iti daśa mūlikārthāḥ' is dropped by the Kalpataru and then it has the whole of the passage from 'atha mūlaprakṛtiravyaktam' up to 'abhimāna ityanarthāntaram',[2264] after which it adds a short passage not found in Aparārka (which is quoted below). It has the passage 'prakṛter mahānutpadyate' up to 'ityutpatti-kramaḥ'.

Both Aparārka and Kṛtyakalpataru (Mokṣakāṇḍa) quote verses from Yama on the Sāṅkhya system, which are cited in

---

2264. After अभिमान इत्यनर्थान्तरम् occurring in note 2263 the कृत्यकल्पतरु reads: सत्तामात्रलक्षणानि तन्मात्राणि स्वानुग्रहलक्षणानीन्द्रियाण्यक्षाणीन्द्रियाण्युच्यन्ते। सङ्कल्पलक्षणं मनः। इन्द्रियार्थलक्षणा विषयविशेषा भूतानीत्यनर्थान्तरम्। सर्वपूर्विका प्रकृतिः। In some cases the editor of the Mokṣakāṇḍa has not correctly separated the clauses. On p. 100 he should have printed 'गन्धतन्मात्रमिति तन्मात्राणि। द्विविधानीन्द्रियाणि। मनो भूतविशेषाश्च विकाराः। ... दश बहिःकरणानीन्द्रियाणि च।'.

the note below. It will be noticed that after enumerating the twenty-five tattvas Yama adds Puruṣottama as the 26th tattva.[2265]

Purāṇas contain lengthy disquisitions on the Sāṅkhya doctrines. For example, the Viṣṇupurāṇa I. 2. 19–23, 25–62, VI. 4. 13-15, 17, 32-40 (in all about 66 verses) are full of Sāṅkhya doctrines and are all quoted in the Kṛtyakalpataru (Mokṣakāṇḍa pp. 102–108). But that Purāṇa emphasizes that Paramātman (called Viṣṇu) is the support of all tattvas. In Viṣṇupurāṇa I. 2. 22–23 it is asserted[2266] that *brahmavādins* who are proficient in Vedic doctrines recite (a verse) that expounds pradhāna, (and state) 'there was then (before creation) neither day nor night, no sky nor earth, neither darkness nor light, there was only *one* male brahma that was evolved as pradhāna and that could not be apprehended by the ear (and other indriyas) or by *buddhi*. Verses 39–40 (of Viṣṇupurāṇa VI. 4) assert that both[2267] prakṛti and puruṣa become dissolved in the Highest Self who is called Viṣṇu in Vedas and Vedāntas (Upaniṣads).

Many other Purāṇas devote a great deal of space to the elucidation of Sāṅkhya doctrines and terminology. Considerations of space preclude any statement beyond references to

2265. मनो बुद्धिरहङ्कारः खानिलाग्निजलानि भूः। एताः प्रकृतयस्त्वष्टौ विकाराः षोडशापरे॥ श्रोत्राक्षिरसनघ्राणत्वचः सङ्कल्प एव च। शब्दरूपरसस्पर्शगन्धवाक्पाणिपायवः। पादाबुपस्थ इति ते विकाराः षोडश स्मृताः॥ चतुर्विंशकमित्येतज्ज्ञानमाहुर्मनीषिणः। पञ्चविंशकमव्यक्तं षड्विंशः पुरुषोत्तमः। एतज्ज्ञात्वा तु मुच्यन्ते यतयः शान्तबुद्धयः। पञ्चविंशतितत्त्वज्ञो यत्र तत्राश्रमे रतः। प्रकृतिज्ञो विकारज्ञो याति विष्णोः परं पदम्॥ यम q. by अपरार्क p. 988 and कृत्यकल्पतरु (मोक्षकाण्ड) pp. 101–102, which combines the first and 4th quarters of the last verse and reads पञ्चविंशतितत्त्वज्ञो याति विष्णोः परं पदम्. In the commentary reconstructed from the Chinese translation by Paramārtha (edited by Pandit Aiyaswami) occurs the verse पञ्चविंशतितत्त्वज्ञो यत्र तत्राश्रमे वसेत्। जटी मुण्डी शिखी वापि मुच्यते नात्र संशयः॥' (on p. 5 and again on p. 55 on Kārikā 37). This verse occurs in गौडपाद's भाष्य on कारिका one. भावागणेश (1550–1600 A. D.) in तत्त्वयाथार्थ्यदीपन (Chow. S. S.) ascribes this last verse to पञ्चशिख.

2266. वेदवादविदो विद्वन्नियता ब्रह्मवादिनः। पठन्ति चैवमेवार्थं प्रधानप्रतिपादकम्॥ नाहो न रात्रिर्न नभो न भूमिर्नासीत्तमो ज्योतिरभूच्च नान्यत्। श्रोत्रादिबुद्ध्यानुपलभ्यमेकं प्राधानिकं ब्रह्म पुमांस्तदासीत्॥ ... ततस्तु तत्परं ब्रह्म परमात्मा जगन्मयः। ... प्रधानपुरुषौ चापि प्रविश्य स्वेच्छया हरिः। क्षोभयामास संप्राप्ते सर्गकाले व्ययाव्ययौ॥ विष्णुपुराण I. 2. 22–23, 28–29 quoted by कृत्यकल्पतरु (मोक्षकाण्ड, p. 103). The first two verses have in view the famous Ṛgveda hymn X. 129 (verses 1–2).

2267. प्रकृतिर्या मया ख्याता व्यक्ताव्यक्तस्वरूपिणी। पुरुषश्चाप्युभावेतौ लीयेते परमात्मनि। परमात्मा च सर्वेषामाधारः परमेश्वरः। विष्णुनाम्ना स वेदेषु वेदान्तेषु च गीयते॥ विष्णुपु० VI. 4. 39-40, q. by कृत्यकल्प० (on मोक्ष p. 108).

chapters and verses of some Purāṇas and the citation of a few striking or informative verses. Matsya (3. 14–29) begins with prakṛti, guṇas and all the twenty-five tattvas, remarks that the three gods, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Maheśvara, though one, arose from the guṇas being put into activity and winds up by saying that Sāṅkhya is full of enumerations and was proclaimed by Kapila and others.[2268] The Brahmapurāṇa (1. 33–35, 33. 3–4, 242, 67–70, 76–85) recounts the tattvas from prakṛti to kṣetrajña and remarks at the end that the soul becomes *kevala* (free from all contacts and liberated) when he realizes the truth about himself. The Padmapurāṇa in several places dilates upon the tattvas of the Sāṅkhya such as in Pātālakhaṇḍa 85. 11–18, Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa, chap. 2. 88–103, chap. 15. 177–187, which closely follow the S. Kārikā verses. The Kūrmapurāṇa (I. 4. 13–35) states that Maheśvara enters prakṛti and puruṣa, activates them and sets out Sāṅkhya ideas and in II. 7. 21–26 it refers to the twenty-four tattvas and the state of equilibrium (sāmyāvasthā). The Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa in chap. 42. 32–62 treats of creation with Sāṅkhya terminology. Three verses of the Brahmāṇḍa IV. 3. 37–46 referring to the threefold bondage (bandha) are quoted by the Kṛtyakalpataru (mokṣa) p. 124. Similarly, Brahmāṇḍa (II. 32. 71–76) employ the Sāṅkhya terminology of mahat, ahaṅkara &c. Prof. Das Gupta in 'Indian Philosophy' vol. IV. pp. 24–48 deals at some length with Kapila's philosophy in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa and Sri Siddhesvara Bhattacharya contributes a paper 'a critique of the Bhāgavata' in JBRS for 1950 pp. 9–50 in which he severely criticizes Prof. Das Gupta.

2268. सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्चैव गुणत्रयमुदाहृतम् । साम्यावस्थितिरेतेषां प्रकृतिः परिकीर्तिता ॥ केचित्प्रधानमित्याहुरव्यक्तमपरे जनाः । एतदेव प्रजासृष्टिं करोति विकरोति च ॥ गुणेभ्यः क्षोभ्यमाणेभ्यस्त्रयो देवा विजज्ञिरे । एका मूर्तिस्त्रयो भागा ब्रह्मविष्णुमहेश्वराः । ... सांख्यं कपिलादिभिरुच्यते । मत्स्य 3.14-16,29. Vide वैकारिकस्तैजसश्च भूतादिश्चैव तामसः । त्रिविधोयमहङ्कारो महत्तत्त्वादजायत । भूतेन्द्रियाणां पञ्चानां तथा कर्मेन्द्रियैः सह ॥ पद्म, सृष्टिखण्ड chap. 2. 89–90; compare सां. का. 24–25. आकाशवायुतेजांसि सलिलं पृथिवी तथा । शब्दादिभिर्गुणैर्वीर युक्तानीत्युत्तरोत्तरैः । शान्ता घोराश्च मूढाश्च विशेषास्तेन ते स्मृताः । *ibid*, chap. 2. 99–100; the half verse शान्ता...स्मृताः occurs in मार्कण्डेयपु. (Venk. ed.) 42 57 and कूर्म *I. 4. 33*; compare सां. का. 38 तन्मात्राण्यविशेषास्तेभ्यो भूतानि पञ्च पञ्चभ्यः । एते स्मृता विशेषाः शान्ता घोराश्च मूढाश्च ॥; vide पद्म, सृष्टिखण्ड 15. 177–179 चतुर्विंशतितत्त्वानि प्रधानादीनि संख्यया । अचेतनानि भोग्यानि पुरुषः पञ्चविंशकः । चेतनः पुरुषो भोक्ता न कर्ता तस्य कर्मणः । आत्मा नित्योऽव्ययश्चैव अधिष्ठाता प्रयोजकः ।; पातालखण्ड 85. 11–12 are the same with slight variation; compare सां. का. 17 and 19 'पुरुषोस्ति भोक्तृभावात्कैवल्यार्थं प्रवृत्तेश्च ॥ तस्माच्च विपर्यासात् सिद्धं साक्षित्वमस्य पुरुषस्य । कैवल्यं माध्यस्थ्यं द्रष्टृत्वमकर्तृभावश्च ॥'.

Vide Bhāgavatapurāṇa III. 26. The Varāhapurāṇa (B. I. ed. of 1893) narrates the story of king Aśvaśiras to whom Kapila and Jaigīṣavya (the prince of Yogins) came after he had performed the avabhṛtha bath and was surrounded by brāhmaṇas and who asked them how the highest Nārāyaṇa was to be worshipped, when the two told him that they were themselves Nārāyaṇa. On his doubting these words of theirs Kapila assumed the form of Viṣṇu and Jaigīṣavya of Garuḍa and after other similar wonders, the king requested that his doubt whether Mokṣa is attained by him who follows karmamārga or jñānamārga be resolved. The same Purāṇa in chap. 25 (verses 1–5) declares that *avyakta*, the first tattva, made up of three (guṇas) arose from the highest Puruṣa, from the union of the two ahaṅkāra was produced also called mahat, that Puruṣa is named Viṣṇu or Śiva while avyakta is called Umā, Devī or Śrī and Guha (Kārtikeya) is ahaṅkāra. The Bhāgavatapurāṇa (I. 3. 10) mentions Kapila as the fifth avatāra of Viṣṇu (vide above p. 1373) and (in X. 8. 37–38) states that when Yaśodā asked the child Kṛṣṇa to open his mouth she saw inside the mouth the whole world, the five elements, the indriyas, mind, mātrās and the three guṇas. Even great poets like Kālidāsa and Bāṇa are fond of utilising Sāṅkhya doctrines and terminology. For example, vide Kumārasambhava II. 4 (Guṇatrayavibhāgāya &c.), Raghuvaṁśa X. 38 (aṅgināṁ tamasevobhau guṇau prathamamadhyamau), Raghuvaṁśa VIII. 21 (Raghurapyajayad-guṇa-trayam prakṛtistham &c.); Kādambarī, very first verse (rajojuṣe janmani...triguṇātmane namaḥ).

Even the Tantras were influenced by the Sāṅkhya system as the Śāradātilaka shows (vide above p. 1061).

It is not a vain boast when the Śāntiparva[2269] asserts that whatever knowledge is found in the Vedas, in Sāṅkhya and Yoga, in the various Purāṇas, in the extensive itihāsas, in the arthaśāstra and whatever knowledge exists in the world, all that is derived from the Sāṅkhya. For a dispassionate appraisal of the Sāṅkhya theory of evolution and its stages, vide Dr. Behanan's work on 'Yoga' chap. IV. pp. 63–91.

2269. ज्ञानं महद्यद्धि महत्सु राजन् वेदेषु सांख्येषु तथैव योगे। यच्चापि दृष्टं विविधं पुराणं (णे?) सांख्यागतं तन्निखिलं नरेन्द्र॥ यच्चेतिहासेषु महत्सु दृष्टं यच्चार्थशास्त्रे नृपशिष्टजुष्टे। ज्ञानं च लोके यदिहास्ति किंचित्सांख्यागतं तच्च महन्महात्मन्॥ शान्ति 290. 103–104 (= 301. 108–109 of Chitrashala edition).

CHAPTER XXXII

Yoga and Dharmaśāstra

Sāṅkhya and Yoga often go together in the Upaniṣads as well as in the Mahābhārata, the Bhagavadgītā and the Purāṇas and their relationship to one another is the same in all these. In Śv. Up. VI. 13, Vanaparva 2. 15, Śāntiparva[2270] 228. 28, 289. 1, 306. 65, 308. 25, 326. 100, 336. 69, Anuśāsana 14. 323, Bhagavadgītā V. 4–5, Padma-purāṇa (Pātālakhaṇḍa, 85. 11 ff), the two are mentioned together.

Though Sāṅkhya greatly influenced all works dealing with the evolution of the world in its various aspects, it did not enjoy that great esteem among all sorts of people in India that the Yoga system enjoyed and still enjoys. The word *yoga* is derived from the root 'yuj' to join or to unite (of *rudhādi* class). The germs of yoga can be traced back to the Ṛgveda. Ṛgveda V. 81. 1 (a verse in praise of Savitṛ) reads 'wise men, priests and sacrificers concentrate their minds and join their prayers to the wise, the great (Savitṛ), who knows all (prayers)'. Another Vedic[2271] verse also speaks of concentrating the mind. The word 'yoga' occurs frequently in the Ṛgveda in several shades of meaning. Sāyaṇa in many passages takes 'yoga' to mean 'acquiring what is not already possessed' (as in Ṛg. I. 5. 3). In Ṛg. I. 18. 7 God Sadasaspati (Agni) is said to pervade the prayers (or thoughts) of sacrificers. In Ṛg. I. 34. 9 it means 'yoking' (kadā yogo vājino rāsabhasya yena yajñam nāsatyopayāthaḥ'. The word 'yoga' is often used with the word *kṣema* (separately as in Ṛg. VII. 54. 3, VII. 86. 8) or as a compound

---

2270. पञ्चविंशतितत्त्वानि तुल्यान्युभयतः समम्। योगे सांख्येऽपि च तथा विशेषांस्तत्र मे शृणु॥ शान्ति 228. 28 (=236. 29 Ch. ed.)

2271. युंजते मन उत युञ्जते धियो विप्रा विप्रस्य बृहतो विपश्चितः। वि होत्रा दधे वयुनाविदेक इन्मही देवस्य सवितुः परिष्टुतिः॥ ऋ. V. 81. 1 = तै. सं. I. 2. 13. 1, काठकसंहिता II. 51 and XV. 36, वाज. सं. 11. 4, श्वे. उप. II. 4. Ṛg. I. 18. 7 is यस्मादृते न सिध्यति यज्ञो विपश्चितश्चन। स धीनां योगमिन्वति॥; युञ्जानः प्रथमं मनस्तत्त्वाय सविता धियः। अग्नेर्ज्योतिर्निचाय्य पृथिव्या अध्याभरत्। तै. सं. IV. 1. 1. 1, वाज. सं. XI. 1 and श्वे. उप. II. 1

(as in Ṛg. X. 166. 5 'Yogakṣemam va ādāyāham bhūyāsam-uttamaḥ'). There is a great distance or gap between the meaning of the word yoga in the Ṛgveda (even in the verses about concentrating the mind) and its meaning in some of the Upaniṣads and in classical Sanskrit. In Ṛg. X. 136. 2–3 there is mention[2272] of *munis*, sons of Vātaraśana, who wore dirty and tawny garments and who say in verse 3 'we being in ecstasy (or wild bliss) owing to our way of life as munis resort to winds; mortals! you look on our bodies only'. This shows that even in those ancient times, some people practised *tapas*, did not care what clothes they wore and thought they (i. e. their souls) would be merged in the wind (that is, the souls are formless and could not be seen). In Ṛg. VIII. 17. 14 Indra is said to be a friend of munis and muni is also a friend of every god in Ṛg. X. 136. 4. But as to *yatis* the position was rather different. The word *yati* occurs several times in the Ṛgveda but in most cases that word has no certain connection with the meaning of 'ascetic'. In Ṛg. VIII. 3. 9 'by which (says brahmā priest) wealth was given to Bhṛgu from the yatis and by which you helped (or protected) Praskaṇva'; here Indra seems to be opposed to yatis. In Ṛg. VIII. 6. 18 the poet says 'O valiant Indra! listen to my prayer alone from among the yatis and Bhṛgus that praised thee'. Here Sāyaṇa explains 'yatayaḥ' as 'Aṅgirasaḥ'. In any case 'yatis' are here shown to be devotees of Indra. But in other Saṁhitās it is said that Indra threw 'yatis' to the wolves or hyenas.[2273] Later on, however, the meaning of *yati* seems to have changed. In these Saṁhitā passages 'yatis' appear to be persons hostile or alien to the Vedic rites, but what they did to deserve

---

2272. मुनयो वातरशनाः पिशङ्गा वसते मला। वातस्यानु ध्राजिं यन्ति यद्देवासो अविक्षत॥ उन्मदिता मौनेयेन वाताँ आ तस्थिमा वयम्। शरीरेदस्माकं यूयं मर्तासो अभि पश्यथ॥ ऋ. X. 136. 2–3. According to the सर्वानुक्रमणी the sages of seven verses of the hymn are जूतिर्वातजूतिर्विप्रजूतिर्वृषाणकः। करिक्रत एतश ऋष्यशृङ्गश्चैकर्चाः. मौनेय is derived from मुनि and means मुनेर्भावः. The word 'Keśin' (having hair, hairy, by metaphor 'possessing rays' applied to the Sun or Fire) occurs five times in the first verse of this hymn and two times more in the other verses. 'Muni' appears thrice in this hymn and once more in 'mauneya'. Dr. Haüer in 'Der yoga als Hailweg' (1932) remarks (on p. 13) that the word 'muni' is probably related to Greek 'mantis' (prophet).

2273. इन्द्रो यतीन् सालावृकेभ्यः प्रायच्छत् तान् दक्षिणत उत्तरवेद्या आदन्। तै. सं. VI. 2.7.5; vide also तै. सं. II. 4.9.2 'यतीनामद्यमानानां शीर्षाणि परापतन् ते खर्जूरा अभवन्॥'. Vide also काठकसंहिता VIII.5 and XI.10 and ऐ. ब्रा. 35.2. In कौषीतक्युप. III, 1 (Indra says) 'त्रिशीर्षाणं त्वाष्ट्रमहनम्। अरुन्मुखान् यतीन् सालावृकेभ्यः प्रायच्छम्।'.

slaughter by Indra is not clear. In Atharvaveda II. 5. 3 Indra is said to have killed Vṛtra as he did in the case of yatis. Some of the Upaniṣads, however, show that 'yati' was a person who had given up worldly affairs, practised yoga and endeavoured after the knowledge of Ātman and realized Brahma; vide Muṇḍaka Up. III. 1. 5 (yam paśyanti yatayaḥ kṣīṇadoṣāḥ) and III. 2. 6 (sannyāsayogād-yatayaḥ śuddhasattvāḥ). Some like Haüer in 'Die Anfrange der Yoga-praxis', 1922 pp. 11 ff) hold that the Vrātyas of Atharvaveda XV were ecstatics of the kṣatriya class and forerunners of Yogins.

The word 'yoga' occurs in some of the Upaniṣads in the same sense in which it is employed in the Yogasūtra. In Kaṭha Up. II. 12, it is said[2274] 'the wise man reflecting on God by means of yoga, by concentrating the mind on the inner spirit becomes free from joy and grief' (adhyātmayogādhigamena). The same Upaniṣad says that the state described in VI. 11 is regarded as Yoga because therein the organs (and the mind and buddhi) are firmly held under control. In Kaṭha Up. VI. 18 it is said that Naciketas having understood the *vidyā* and the whole procedure of Yoga propounded by Yama attained (the realization of) *brahma*. The word 'Yoga' occurs in the Tai. Up. II. 4 (in speaking about vijñanamaya ātman, yoga is said to be its *ātman*, the exact sense being doubtful), and in the Śv. Up. II. 11 and VI. 13. Praśna (5. 5-6) speaks of the three mātrās (a, u, m) of Om. In Śv. Up. 1. 3 occurs the word 'dhyānayoga'. The Śv. Up. (II. 8-13) refers to *āsana* and prāṇāyāma and sets out the first signs of the successful practice of Yoga. The Chān. Up. VIII. 15 appears to refer to pratyāhāra (though the technical word is not used) in 'ātmani sarvendriyāṇi pratiṣṭhāpya' (having brought all organs of sense to rest in the ātman).' The Bṛ. Up. (I. 5. 23) appears to refer to prāṇāyāma in 'he should observe the one vow, viz. inhalation and exhalation (tasmād-ekameva vratam caret prāṇyāc-caiva apānyācca).

2274. तां योगमिति मन्यन्ते स्थिरामिन्द्रियधारणाम्। कठ° VI.11; मृत्युप्रोक्तां नचिकेतोऽथ लब्ध्वा विद्यामेतां योगविधिं च कृत्स्नम्। ब्रह्मप्राप्तो विरजोऽभूद्विमृत्युरन्योऽप्येवं यो विदध्यात्ममेव ॥ कठ. VI. 18. The important words in this last are कृत्स्नं योगविधिम्. The idea appears to be that yoga had been fully developed at the time of the Kaṭha Up. but that Upaniṣad did not set it out in detail. It may be further noted that the words एतां विद्यां refer to Brahmavidyā and that yoga-vidhi is separately mentioned (probably as a means to brahma-realization).

The Vedāntasūtra (II. 1. 3 'etena yogaḥ pratyuktaḥ) states that Yoga is refuted by the reasoning adopted for the refutation of the Sāṅkhya system. The position of Śaṅkarācārya as to both Sāṅkhya and Yoga has been stated above (pp. 1352 and 1361 n. 2208 and 2221). He points out in the pūrvapakṣa that Veda [2275] prescribes Yoga as a means of achieving correct knowledge and refers to Bṛ. Up. II. 4. 5. He further points out that in the Śv. Up. Yoga is expounded in great detail after first mentioning the proper posture (for the practice of Yoga) in the words 'having held the body straight but raised high in three places viz. chest, neck and head' (Śv. Up. II. 8). From the words of Śaṅkarācārya that in Yogaśāstra also Yoga is held to be a means of the realisation of right knowledge, it follows that he had a yogaśāstra before him in which occurred the words 'atha...yogaḥ,' but as he does not employ the word Yogasūtra he probably does not refer to a sūtra work. If a conjecture may be hazarded, it is possible that the Yogaśāstra meant by Śaṅkara is a work like the Yogaśāstra ascribed to Yājñavalkya in Yāj. Smṛti III. 110 (Yogaśāstram ca mat-proktam &c.). Śaṅkarācārya admits on V. S. II. 1. 3 that a part of the yoga is acceptable to him but other parts conflict with the Veda. Muṇḍaka Up. (II 2. 6) enjoins *samādhi* in the words 'om-iti dhyāyatha ātmānam' as Śaṅkarācārya states on V. S. II. 3. 39 (samādhyabhāvāc-ca). In the Upaniṣads 'Muni' and 'Yati' have come to denote [2276] the same meaning, e g. Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 22 states 'one becomes muni by realizing this very self,'

2275. सम्यग्दर्शनाभ्युपायो हि योगो वेदे विहितः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः- इति। 'त्रिरुन्नतं स्थाप्य समं शरीरम्' इत्यादिना चासनादिकल्पनापुरःसरं बहुप्रपञ्चं योगविधानं श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषदि दृश्यते। ... योगशास्त्रेऽपि 'अथ तत्त्वदर्शनोपायो योगः' इति सम्यग्दर्शनाभ्युपायत्वेनैव योगोऽङ्गीक्रियते। शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू II. 1. 3. The words अथ...योगः imply that it is a quotation. Compare 'समं कायशिरोग्रीवं धारयन्नचलं स्थिरः।' गीता VI. 13.

2276. एतमेव विदित्वा मुनिर्भवति। एतमेव प्रव्राजिनो लोकमिच्छन्तः प्रव्रजन्ति। बृह. उप. IV. 4. 22; vide कठ. IV. 15 'यथोदकं...एवं मुनेर्विजानत आत्मा भवति गौतम।'. The कौषीतकि-उप. II. 15 has परि वा व्रजेत्. The word परिव्राजक, however, does not occur in the other Upaniṣads. In पाणिनि's day परिव्राजक was well-known as the sūtra 'मस्कर-मस्करिणौ वेणुपरिव्राजकयोः' VI. 1. 154 shows which states that मस्कर means bamboo (staff) and मस्करिन् means परिव्राजक. The महाभाष्य comments that मस्करिन् is not so called because he carries a bamboo staff but because he advises people not to do actions for securing desired objects and that for people quiescence is better 'मा कृत कर्माणि मा कृत कर्माणि शान्तिर्वः श्रेयसीत्याहातो मस्करी परिव्राजकः.'

while the Muṇḍaka (III. 1. 5)[2277] states 'this self is to be attained by Truth, by *tapas*, by right knowledge and by sexual purity at all times: that self resides inside the body (like a light), is pure, whom spotless ascetics realize.' The Kaṭhopaniṣad (III. 13) provides that the wise man should restrain speech in mind (speech and mind, as the text stands), he should keep it within the self which is knowledge, he should keep down knowledge within the self that is the great, and he, should keep that (the great) within the self which is quiet. The Upaniṣads thus not only employ the word 'Yoga' but provide some of the stages of yoga and its technique for realizing the Supreme Spirit. About twenty Yoga Upaniṣads are published at Adyar, edited by A. Mahadev Sastri (1920), but as their chronology is most uncertain and as most of them appear to the present writer to be later than the Mahābhārata, Manu and probably the Yogasūtra, they are passed over here and are referred to in this work sparingly.[2278]

Pāṇini provides for the formation of the words *yama* and *niyama* (two *aṅgas*) of Yoga and the word 'Yogin' appears to have been derived by him from the root 'yuj' with the affix 'ghinuṇ' (i. e. *in*) in the sense of *tācchīlya* (being habituated to) according to Pāṇ. III. 2. 142 (which is a very long sūtra).[2279]

2277. कामक्रोधवियुक्तानां यतीनां यतचेतसाम्। अभितो ब्रह्मनिर्वाणं वर्तते विदितात्मनाम्॥ गीता 5. 26; यच्छेद्वाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञस्तद्यच्छेज्ज्ञान आत्मनि। ज्ञानमात्मनि महति नियच्छेत्तद्यच्छेच्छान्त आत्मनि॥ कठोप. III. 13. शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. I. 4. 1 explains this at length 'वाचं मनसि संयच्छेत् वागादिबाह्येन्द्रियव्यापारमुत्सृज्य मनोमात्रेणावतिष्ठेत'. He takes मनसी as an *ārṣaprayoga* equal to मनसि.

2278. That the yoga Upaniṣads are late productions may be briefly indicated here. Verses 10–14 of the गोरक्षशतक (dealing with the *ādhāra* and *svadhiṣṭhāna* cakras) are found in the ध्यानबिन्दु (verses 43–47) and in the योगचूडामणि (verses 4–9) with slight variations. Vide pp. 1060–1062 and notes 1715–1717 above for the six chakras and the nāḍīs. In the description of prāṇāyāma the Śāṇḍilya Upaniṣad quotes certain verses with the words तद्वेते श्लोका भवन्ति, some of which occur in the गोरक्षशतक. One cannot say definitely that the Śāṇḍilya borrows from G. S., but this is possible. All the ancient and medieval works on the several branches of yoga are not yet available, and therefore one cannot preclude the possibility that Śāṇḍilya and other yoga upaniṣads and गोरक्षशतक borrow from earlier sources not yet discovered.

2279. यमः समुपनिविषु च। पा. III. 3. 63; एषु अनुपसर्गे च यमेरप् वा।... नियमः नियामः। यमः यामः। सि. कौ. याम means प्रहर (watch, 1/8 part of the whole day), while यम means 'restraint' 'यम्यते चित्तं अनेन'. On पा. III. 2. 142 the काशिका remarks 'युज समाधौ दिवादिः। युजिर् योगे रुधादिः। द्वयोरपि ग्रहणम्'.

The Āpastambadharmasūtra (I. 8. 23. 3-6) quotes a verse 'The total destruction of *doṣas* (taints) is due to Yoga in this life; a wise man after having expelled all doṣas that cause harm to all beings reaches peace (mokṣa)' and then it sets out fifteen doṣas such as anger, ecstatic joy, greed, hypocrisy, the destruction of which is due to Yoga and enumerates the qualities that are opposites of the doṣas. This shows that long before the 4th or 5th century B. C. Yoga as a discipline of the mind had been well developed.

The V. S. II. 1. 3 indicates that the Sūtrakāra had before him a body of Yoga doctrines, some of which were the same as those of the Sāṅkhya and he also knew Samādhi (V. S. II. 3. 39). Again, the V. S. mentions (in IV. 2. 21) Yogins and distinguishes Sāṅkhya and Yoga as smārta (and not śrauta). Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. I. 3. 33 quotes the extant Yogasūtra II. 44 (svādhyāyād-iṣṭa-devatā-samprayogaḥ) and on[2280] V. S. II. 4. 12 he appears to be willing to admit that the Yoga-sūtra preceded V. S. and quotes Yogasūtra I. 6 in the 2nd interpretation of that sūtra.

The important question is whether the author of the V. S. refers to the extant Yogasūtra. The present author holds for various reasons that the V. S. does not refer to the present Yoga-sūtra, but to the Yoga doctrines that had been developed even before the Kaṭha Muṇḍaka, Śvetāśvatara and other Upaniṣads.

In the Śāntiparva it is stated that the propounder[2281] of Sāṅkhya was *paramarṣi* (highest sage) Kapila, Hiraṇyagarbha

---

2280. पञ्चवृत्तिर्मनोवद्‍व्यपदिश्यते। वे. सू. II. 4. 12; शांकरभाष्य 'इतश्चास्ति मुख्यस्य प्राणस्य वैशेषिकं कार्यं यत्कारणं पञ्चवृत्तिरयं व्यपदिश्यते श्रुतिषु प्राणोऽपानो व्यान उदानः समानः-इति (बृह. उप. I. 5. 3)। ...एवं तर्हि परमतमप्रतिषिद्धमनुमतं भवतीति न्यायादिहापि योगशास्त्रप्रसिद्धा मनसः पञ्च वृत्तयः परिगृह्यन्ते-प्रमाणविपर्ययविकल्पनिद्रास्मृतयो नाम।. It would be noticed that Śaṅkarācārya first gave one explanation of the word 'manovat' in the V. S. and then he gave another by way of concession.

2281. सांख्यं योगं...नाना मतानि वै॥ सांख्यस्य वक्ता कपिलः परमर्षिः स उच्यते। हिरण्यगर्भो योगस्य वेत्ता (v. l. वक्ता) नान्यः पुरातनः॥ अपान्तरतमाश्चैव वेदाचार्यः स उच्यते। प्राचीनगर्भं तमृषिं प्रवदन्तीह केचन॥ शान्ति 337. 59-61 = चित्र॰ ed. 349. 64-66. For the first verse, vide above p. 954 n 1544 and also 'सांख्यं योगः पञ्चरात्रं वेदारण्यकमेव च। ज्ञानान्येतानि ब्रह्मर्षे लोकेषु प्रचरन्ति हि॥ शान्ति 337. 1.; एवमेकं सांख्ययोगं वेदारण्यकमेव च। परस्पराङ्गान्येतानि पञ्चरात्रं च कथ्यते। एष एकान्तिनां धर्मो नारायणपरात्मकः॥ शान्ति 336. 76 (= 348. 81-82 Ch. ed.). वेदारण्यक probably refers to upaniṣads like the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya, which contain passages about 'nididhyāsa' and the non-difference of *jiva* and *brahma* such as 'tat-tvam-asi'. A *paramarṣi* is defined in the वायुपुराण as 'निवृत्तिसमकालं तु बुद्ध्याऽव्यक्तमृषिः स्वयम्। परं हि ऋषते यस्मात्परमर्षिस्ततः स्मृतः। 59. 80 (vide same verse in Brahmāṇḍa III. 32. 86.

was the ancient knower of Yoga, no one else (knew it); Apāntaratamas was Vedācārya whom some called the sage Prācīnagarbha. In the previous chapter it is stated that Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Vedāraṇyaka and Pañcarātra are one and are aṅgas of each other. In Śānti. 326. 65 Hiraṇyagarbha is again connected with Yogaśāstra. Vide p. 1371 above. In the Anuśāsanaparva [2282] Sanatkumāra appears to be connected with Yoga as the founder, just as Kapila was the founder of Sāṅkhya. In the Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā (XII. 32–33) it is stated that Hiraṇyagarbha first propounded two Yogasaṁhitās, one was called 'Nirodhayoga' and the other was called 'Karmayoga', the first of which was again divided twelve-fold. The Bhāmatī [2283] on V. S. II. 1. 3 states that that sūtra does not totally negative the authoritativeness of the Yogaśāstra of Hiraṇyagarbha and Patañjali. The Viṣṇupurāṇa [2284] appears to quote two verses from Hiraṇyagarbha (vide note below). Vācaspati in his commentary on Yogasūtra I. 1 states that Yogi-Yājñavalkya mentions that Hiraṇyagarbha was the propounder of Yoga. Vācaspati regards the Yogasūtra of Patañjali as later than Yoga-Yājñavalkya-smṛti. Therefore, it is almost certain that the V. S. refutes the doctrines of that Yoga system that was known to the Śāntiparva.

In Śalyaparva (chap. 50) a story is told about *bhikṣu* Jaigīṣavya who was a great Yogin and of 'Asita Devala', a householder staying on the holy Sārasvata-tīrtha.

In the Śāntiparva (cr. ed. chap. 222 = Ch. ed. chap. 229) there is a long dialogue between Jaigīṣavya and Asita about Yoga, one verse (14) [2285] from which may be cited

---

2282. सनत्कुमारो योगानां सांख्यानां कपिलो ह्यसि । अनुशासन 14. 323 (addressed by उपमन्यु to महादेव).

2283. नानेन योगशास्त्रस्य हैरण्यगर्भपातञ्जलादेः सर्वथा प्रामाण्यं निराक्रियते किं तु जगदुपादानस्वतन्त्रप्रधान-तद्विकारमहदहङ्कारपञ्चतन्मात्रागोचरं प्रामाण्यं नास्तीत्युच्यते ।... न चैतानि प्रधानादिसद्भावपराणि किंतु योगस्वरूपतत्साधन-तदवान्तरफलविभूति-तत्परमफल-कैवल्यव्युत्पादनपराणि । भामती on शाङ्करभाष्य II. 1. 3.

2284. ननु हिरण्यगर्भो योगस्य वक्ता नान्यः पुरातनः-इति योगियाज्ञवल्क्यस्मृतेः कथं पतञ्जलेर्योगशास्त्रकर्तृत्वमित्याशङ्क्य सूत्रकारेणानुशासनमित्युक्तम् । शिष्टस्यानुशासनं न तु शासनमित्यर्थः । वाचस्पति on यो. I. 2. The half verse हिरण्य...पुरातनः is बृहद्योगियाज्ञवल्क्य XII. 5 (Lonavla); संभावना परां हानिं योगर्द्धेः कुरुते यतः । जनेनावमतो योगी योगसिद्धिं च विन्दति । तस्माच्चरेत वो योगी सतां धर्ममदूषयन् । जना यथावमन्येरन् गच्छेरन्नैव सङ्गतिम् ॥ हिरण्यगर्भवचनं विचिन्त्याथ महामतिः । आत्मानं दर्शयामास जनोन्मत्ताकृतिं जने ॥ विष्णु II. 13. 42–44.

2285. निन्दाप्रशंसे चात्यर्थं न वदन्ति परस्य ये । न च निन्दाप्रशंसाभ्यां विक्रियन्ते कदाचन ॥ शान्ति 229. 14 (Ch. ed.).

here 'Yogins do not talk much by way of censure and praise of others and their minds are never affected by the praise and censure of them indulged in by others.' In that chap. Jaigīṣavya is described as one who was never angry nor joyful. In the Varāhapurāṇa (4. 14) it is stated that Kapila and Yogirāṭ Jaigīṣavya came to king Aśvaśiras that had taken the *avabhṛtha* bath after Aśvamedha and assumed the forms of Viṣṇu and Garuḍa respectively. It may be noted that on Y. S. II. 55 the bhāṣya quotes several views, but prefers that of Jaigīṣavya. On Y. S. III. 18, [2286] the bhāṣya mentions the dialogue between Āvaṭya and Jaigīṣavya, where the latter's opinion is stated to be that from the point of view of *kaivalya*, the happiness of contentment is also misery, though as compared to pleasures of sense contentment is supposed to be and may be called happiness.

In the Buddhacarita (XII) when Gautama (the future Buddha) approached a philosopher Arāḍa, the latter described to Gautama his idea of the path to mokṣa and mentioned Jaigīṣavya, Janaka and Vṛddha-Parāśara as persons that had become liberated by following that path.[2287]

From these references it follows that Jaigīsavya was a great teacher of Yoga long before the Christian era and probably had composed a work on Yoga not now available.

There are numerous English translations of the Yogasūtra (wholly or partly) and of the Bhāṣya and Vācaspati's Commentary, such as that by Dr. Rajendralal Mitra with text of Y. S., bhāṣya and com. Rājamārtaṇḍa and an appendix (p. 218-227) noting 150 mss. on Yoga (B. I. ed. 1883); Swami Vivekananda's 'Rājayoga' (Vol. I. of collected works, ed. of 1946) pp. 200-304, which translates and explains all the sūtras; Dr. Ganganath Jha's translation (Bombay 1907); translation by Rama Prasad (pub. by Panini office, Allahabad 1910); translation by Prof. J. H. Woods (in the Harvard Oriental Series, 1914) who read with the present author in Bombay for some months in 1909; Geraldine Coster in 'Yoga and Western Psychology' (London, 1934) translates and explains many of

---

2286. भगवाञ्जैगीषव्य उवाच। विषयसुखापेक्षयैवेदमनुत्तमं सन्तोषसुखमुक्तम्। कैवल्यसुखापेक्षया दुःखमेव। भाष्य on यो. सू. III. 18. सन्तोष is one of the five niyamas (यो. सू. II. 32) and यो. सू. II. 42 is सन्तोषादनुत्तमः सुखलाभः.

2287. जैगीषव्योऽपि जनको वृद्धश्चैव पराशरः। इमं पन्थानमासाद्य मुक्ता ह्यन्ये च मोक्षिणः॥ बुद्धचरित XII. 67.

Patañjali's sūtras (pp. 100–131); 'Aphorisms of Yoga' done into English by Shree Purohita Swami and Intro. by W. B. Yeats (Faber & Faber, London, 1937) with figures of Śiddhāsana, Baddhapadmāsana, Paścimottānāsana, Bhujaṅgāsana, Viparītakaraṇī and Matsyendrāsana; 'Bhāratīya Mānasa-śāstra' or 'Pātañjala-yoga-darśana' (Sanskrit text, with a table of contents, errata, Introduction of 232 pages, and meaning and explanation pp. 787 in Marathi) in all 1051 pages, edited by Krishnaji Keshav Kolhatkar and published by K. B. Dhavale, Bombay, 1951—a very exhaustive and useful work, though rather diffuse and marred by a few uncritical statements.

The number of works and papers on Yoga in general written by Indian and Western authors is very large. The present author has not read many of them. He may mention the following among those that he read or consulted; 'Rājayoga' (complete works of Vivekananda, ed. of 1946, Mayavati, vol. I. pp. 119-313); 'Yoga technique in the Great Epic' by W. Hopkins in JAOS vol. 22 for 1901 pp. 333–379; 'Yoga as a philosophy and religion' by Prof. S. N. Das Gupta (London, 1924), and 'Yoga philosophy (Uni. of Calcutta, 1930); Dr. J. W. Haüer's 'Die Anfrange der Yogapraxis im Alten Indien' (Stuttgart, 1922) and 'Der Yoga Als Heilweg nach den Indischen quellen Dargestellt, Stuttgart, 1932; this is a careful and systematic study of Yoga; this work (pp. 101–127) gives the transliterated text of the Yoga-sūtra with translation in German not in serial order but by subjects (such as yogāṅgas, kriyāyoga, Īśvarapraṇidhāna); Dr. Radhakrishnan's 'Indian Philosophy' vol. II. pp. 336–373 (London, 1931); 'The mysterious Kuṇḍalinī' by Dr. J. G. Rele (Taraporevala and sons, Bombay, 1927); 'Yoga, the science of health' by Felix Guyot (in French), translated by J. Carling, London, 1937 (3rd ed.), expounding the practical principles of Haṭha-yoga; 'Yoga, a scientific[2288] evaluation' by Dr. K. T. Behanan. pub. by Macmillan & Co., New York, 1937 (the author studied at Kaivalya-dhāma for a year); 'Tibetan Yoga and secret doctrine' by W. Y. Evans-Wentz (Oxford Uni. Press, 1935) and 'Tibetan Book of the Dead' by the same author (Oxford, 1927); 'A search in secret India' by Paul Brunton (London, 1947); Paul Tuxen's 'the religions of India' (Copenhagen, 1949);

2288. This is one of the best modern books on Yoga. The present author is much impressed by Dr. Behanan's sincerity, detailed and scientific treatment of Yoga and the very frank appraisal of some Yoga practices (pp. 225–249) at the end.

'Tibetan Yoga' by Bernard Bromage (2nd ed. of 1939) pp. 108–111; 'Yoga the method of re-integration' by Allain Danielou (London, 1949); the author states that the exposition is based on yoga works and also on the teachings of living exponents; it is a useful book with six illustrations and 352 Sanskrit texts; 'The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation' ed. by W. G. Evans-Wentz (Oxford Uni. Press, 1954); pp. XXIX–LXIV contain C. G. Jung's Psychological commentary and pp. 63–69 on astrology; 'Source-book of Indian Philosophy' by Dr. Radhakrishnan and C. A. Moore; gives translation of the whole yogasūtra with extracts from the bhāṣya; Mercea Eliade's 'Yoga, immortality and freedom' translated from French into English by Willard R. Trask (London, 1958); 'Haṭhayoga, an advanced method of physical education and concentration' by Prof. S. S. Goswami (L. N. Fowler, London, 1959); this is a very valuable book; it deals scientifically with yoga in all its aspects, but particularly with āsanas of which 108 photographs are given; 'Concentration' by Mouni Sadhu (London, 1959); 'The Lotus and the Robot' by A. Koestler (London, 1960).

Many editions of the Yogasūtra of Patañjali with the bhāṣya of Vyāsa and the commentary (called Tattvavaiśāradī) of Vācaspati have been printed in India. I shall mention only two or three editions of the text of the Sūtra and the two commentaries viz. the edition by the late Pandit Rajaram Shastri Bodas, printed in beautiful type at the Nirṇayasāgara Press in 1892 and the other, the Ānandāśrama edition of 1932 which contains the sūtra, bhāṣya, Vācaspati's commentary and also the commentary called Rājamārtaṇḍa of king Bhoja. In the Kashi Sanskrit series the Yogasūtra was printed (in 1930) with six commentaries viz. the Rājamārtaṇḍa of Bhojarāja, the Pradīpikā of Bhāvā Gaṇeśa, vṛtti by Nāgoji-bhaṭṭa, the Maṇiprabhā by Rāmānandayati, the Candrikā by Anantadeva and the Yoga-sudhākara by Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī.[2288a]

The Yogasūtra, as compared with the sūtras of some other darśanas, is a brief one. It is divided into four *pādas*, viz.

2288a. It should be noted that Bhojadeva omits Yogasūtra IV. 16 (न चैकचित्ततन्त्रं चेद्वस्तु तत्प्रमाणकं तदा किं स्यात्) which is commented upon in the Vyāsabhāṣya and by Vācaspati. On the other hand, Yogasūtra III. 20 (na ca tat-sālambanam tasyāviṣayībhūtatvāt) does not occur in the edition of Pandit Bodas Shastri and is not commented upon by Bhāvā Gaṇeśa and Nāgoji. The form of the sūtra in Y. S. IV. 16 makes one feel some doubt about its genuineness, but as it is explained by the bhāṣya and Vācaspati, one has to accept it as genuine.

Samādhi (concentration), Sādhana (means of attainment), Vibhūti (super-normal powers) and Kaivalya (aloofness, liberation). There are only 195 sūtras in all the pādas together (51+55+55+34).

Dr. Radhakrishnan in 'Indian Philosophy' (vol. II. of the ed. of 1931 pp. 341-42) holds that the author of the Yogasūtra is not later than 300 A. D. Prof. S. N. Das Gupta in 'History of Indian Philosophy' (vol. I. pp. 226-238) is in favour of the identity of the two Patañjalis and therefore holds that the author of the Yogasūtra flourished in the 2nd century B. C.[2289] The Sanskrit paper of Pandit R. Ramamūrtiśarmā in J. of Veṅkaṭeśvara Institute of Tirupati (vol. II. pp. 289-294) and Mr. Govind Das's brief note in I. A. vol. 44 (for 1915 p. 24) may also be read in this connection. Jacobi and (following him) Keith hold that the Yogasūtra (I. 40), meaning at the most 'the mastery of the Yogin extends from the minutest particle to the greatest magnitude imaginable',[2290] refers to the atomic theory of the world. This is a good sample of the way in which even great Western writers read in simple words later theories and try to give late dates to early works. The Upaniṣads speak of the self as more minute than what is *aṇu* and as greater than the great and the Mahābhārata also uses the same phraseology. There is no convincing reason to suppose that the Yogasūtra refers only to a theory of atoms propounded in the Vaiśeṣika system and is not paraphrasing the words of the Upaniṣad and the Mahābhārata.

We have also to consider the early tradition embodied in an introductory verse in Bhojadeva's commentary (not later than 1055 A. D.) and mentioned by Cakrapāṇi (commentator

---

2289. Most scholars accept 2nd century B. C. as the date of the Mahābhāṣya. Dr. D. C. Sircar in I. H. Q. vol. 15 (pp. 633-638) tries to show that the Mahābhāṣya cannot be placed earlier than the 2nd century A. D. His arguments cannot be discussed here. The present author does not agree with Dr. Sircar and holds that the arguments for placing the Mahābhāṣya in the 2nd century B. C. are far more weighty than those put forward by Dr. Sircar.

2290. अणोरणीयान् महतो महीयानात्मास्य जन्तोर्निहितो गुहायाम्। कठोप. II. 20, श्वेता. उ. III. 20; 'अणोरणीयो महतो महत्तरं तदात्मना पश्यति युक्त आत्मवान्। शान्तिपर्व 232.33 (cr. ed.); the योगसूत्र I. 40 is 'परमाणुपरममहत्त्वान्तोऽस्य वशीकारः'. शब्दानामनुशासनं विदधता पातञ्जले कुर्वता वृत्तिं राजमृगाङ्कसंज्ञकमपि व्यातन्वता वैद्यके। वाक्चेतोवपुषां मलः फणिभृतां भर्त्रेव येनोद्धृतस्तस्य श्रीरणरङ्गमल्लनृपतेर्वाचो जयन्त्युज्ज्वलाः॥ 5th Intro verse of Bhoja's vṛtti called राजमार्तण्ड on योगसूत्र.

of the Carakasaṁhitā[2291] (about 1060 A. D.) that Patañjali (deemed to be an *avatāra* of Śeṣa) composed works on Grammar, Yoga and Medicine.

The present author cannot deal at length in this volume with the two questions of identity and of the dates of the two works, as he is mainly concerned with the influence of Yoga on Dharmaśāstra works. He thinks that hardly any cogent arguments have been advanced to positively disprove the identity of the authors of the Mahābhāṣya and of the Yogasūtra. Whether the revision of Caraka's work was done by the same Patañjali is very doubtful. In the Śāntiparva the founder of *Cikitsita* (medicine) is said to have been Kṛṣṇātreya and not Caraka nor Patañjali. The Caraka-saṁhitā uses the expression 'iti ha smāha bhagavān-Ātreyaḥ' in the beginning of its chapters. Caraka (in I. 1. 23 ff) states that the sage Bharadvāja learnt Āyurveda from Indra. His pupil was Punarvasu Ātreya, who had six disciples viz. Agniveśa, Bheḍa, Jatūkarṇa, Parāśara, Hārita and Kṣārapāṇi. First, Agniveśa composed a treatise on Āyurveda and read it to Ātreya and then Bheḍa and others did so. In the chapter called 'Tisraiṣaṇīya' in Caraka-saṁhitā (I. 11. 75) Kṛṣṇātreya's view is specially mentioned. Therefore, it appears that Kṛṣṇātreya[2292] is different from Ātreya who is reverently mentioned at the beginning of Caraka's chapters. Even the Buddhacarita of Aśvaghoṣa mentions Ātreya as the first propounder of medical science.

It is possible to argue that the tradition that Pātañjali dealt with Yoga and Grammar is older than the Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari. That work states in its first section[2293] (called Brahmakāṇḍa) that the taints that affect the body, speech and

---

2291. पातञ्जल-महाभाष्य-चरकप्रतिसंस्कृतैः। मनोवाक्कायदोषाणां हर्त्रेऽहिपतये नमः॥ Intro. verse to com. on चरक. Another verse to the same effect is योगेन चित्तस्य पदेन वाचां मलं शरीरस्य च वैद्यकेन। योऽपाकरोत्तं प्रवरं मुनीनां पतञ्जलिं प्राञ्जलिरानतोऽस्मि॥ cited in योगवार्तिक of विज्ञानभिक्षु.

2292. वेदाविद्वेद भगवान् वेदाङ्गानि बृहस्पतिः। भार्गवो नीतिशास्त्रं च जगाद जगतो हितम्॥ गान्धर्वं नारदो वेदं भरद्वाजो धनुर्ग्रहम्। देवर्षिचरितं गार्ग्यः कृष्णात्रेयश्चिकित्सितम्। न्यायतन्त्राण्यनेकानि तैस्तैरुक्तानि वादिभिः। शान्ति 203. 18–20 (cr. ed. = 210. 20–22 of Ch. ed.); चिकित्सितं यच्च चकार नात्रिः पश्चात्तदात्रेय ऋषिर्जगाद॥ बुद्धचरित I. 50. Aśvaghoṣa is held to have flourished in the first or 2nd century A. D.

2293. कायवाग्बुद्धिविषया ये मलाः समवस्थिताः। चिकित्सा-लक्षणाध्यात्मशास्त्रैस्तेषां विशुद्धयः॥ वाक्यपदीय I. 148; अलब्धगाधे गाम्भीर्यादुत्तान इव सौष्ठवात्। वाक्यपदीय II. 485; तदेवं ब्रह्मकाण्डे कायवाग्बुद्धिविषया ये मलाः—इत्यादि श्लोकेन भाष्यकारप्रशंसा उक्ता, इह चैव भाष्यप्रशंसेति शास्त्रस्य शास्त्रकर्तुश्च टीकाकृता महत्त्वोपवर्णिता। हेलाराज's टीका.

intellect are purified (respectively) by the sciences of medicine, grammar and metaphysics. Then in the eulogy of the Mahābhāṣya it remarks 'alabdhagādhe gāmbhīryād-uttāna iva sauṣṭhavāt', on which the commentator explains that in the verse from the Brahmakāṇḍa the author of the Mahābhāṣya is praised and in the other verse there is praise of the bhāṣya itself. From this it appears to follow that according to the commentator the Vākyapadīya attributes the three śāstras on medicine, grammar and metaphysics (i. e. Yoga) to Patañjali himself.

Even if it be held that the authors of the Yogasūtra and of the Mahābhāṣya are different persons, there are hardly any reasons for definitely assigning the author of the Yogasūtra to a date later than the 2nd or 3rd century A. D. The date of the Yogabhāṣya of Vyāsa is of considerable importance in arriving at the probable date of the Yogasūtra. But the question of the date of the Yogabhāṣya is also debatable. The Vyāsa who composed the Yogabhāṣya would have to be held as different from Vedavyāsa, the reputed author of the Mahābhārata.

The author of the Yogasūtra is, according to the tradition embodied in such comparatively early commentaries as that of Vācaspatimiśra, said to be Patañjali. Important questions arise as to his age and his identity with Patañjali, the author of the famous Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini's grammar and the Vārtikas thereon. The grammarian Patañjali is generally held to have flourished about 150 B. C. Therefore, the question of identity becomes important for the date of the Yogasūtra. Some scholars like Prof. B. Liebich, Dr. Hauer (p. 98 of the work of 1932) and Prof. Das Gupta favour the identity of the two, but several others such as Jacobi, Keith, Woods, Renou are against it. Prof. Renou (in I. H. Q. vol. XVI. pp. 586–591) examines the question from the grammatical point of view, points out that certain words like Pratyāhāra, Upasarga, Pratyaya are used in the Yogasūtra in senses entirely different from the senses of these words in the Mahābhāṣya. But as the subjects of the two works are entirely different, the same words may have acquired different senses. Similarly, Prof. Renou relies on breaches of grammatical rules (in the Yogasūtra I. 34), while he says that Patañjali in the Mahābhāṣya is very strict in following Pāṇini's rules though Pāṇini himself is rarely not strict in observing his own rules as in 'tat-prayojako hetuśca' (I. 4. 55) which is against his own sūtra 'tṛjakābhyām kartari' (II. 2. 15); but

Patañjali also employs such an expressions as 'aviravikanyāya'[2294] (which should be avyavikanyāyena) for which Patañjali is criticized in the long Pūrvapakṣa on Vyākaraṇa contained in the Tantravārtika and which is not explained away in the reply to the Pūrvapakṣa. It cannot be supposed that the Yogasūtra for the first time settled the technical terms of Yoga. Yoga terms had been evolving from Upaniṣad times and Patañjali only used them in the sense which they had acquired in the course of centuries. Prof. Renou arrives at the conclusion that the Yogasūtra is later by several centuries than the Mahābhāṣya. Jacobi in his paper on 'the dates of the philosophical sūtras of the Brāhmaṇas' (in JAOS, vol. 31 pp. 1–29) holds (p. 29) that the Yogasūtra must be later that the 5th century A. D. and, following Garbe, thinks that it is not improbable that the Vyāsabhāṣya was composed in the 7th century A. D. The views of Jacobi are strongly criticized by Jwala Prasad in J. R. A. S. for 1930 pp. 365–375. The present author disagrees with Jacobi and Prof. Renou.

The date of the Yogabhāṣya will have considerable bearing on the date of the Yogasūtra. The Yogabhāṣya presupposes much literary activity on Yoga. It mentions by name on Y. S. II. 55 and on III. 18 Jaigīṣavya who is a prominent figure in the Mahābhārata as shown above (pp. 1367 and 1374). Vide also the story of Asita Devala with whom Jaigīṣavya stayed for many years as a bhikṣu and adept in Yoga (Śalyaparva, chap. 50). It has to be remembered that several interpretations of the same Yogasūtra are noted in the bhāṣya (as on II. 55). The Yogabhāṣya quotes several *Kārikās* and verses dealing with the matters treated of in the Y. S. as on Y. S. I. 28, 48, II. 5, 28 (on nine causes that lead to Vivekakhyāti), II. 32, III, 6, III. 15 (on seven Cittadharmas of the *apariḍṛṣṭa* type). Besides these, several quotations in prose are cited in the bhāṣya, many of which are attributed to Pañcaśikha by Vācaspati (vide pp. 1373–74 above), and some (as on II. 22, 30, 52) to āgamins (those who know the tradition or Veda). Therefore, it follows that some centuries intervene between the Yogasūtra and its bhāṣya.

The Bhāṣya on Y. S. II. 42 quotes a verse with the words 'tathā coktam' (it has also been said), which is identical with

2294. In the महाभाष्य on वार्तिक 2 on पा. IV. 1. 88 and on पा. V. 1. 7 the words अविरविकन्यायेन occur. In the पूर्वपक्ष in the तन्त्रवार्तिक against grammar (vyākaraṇa) it is urged 'भाष्येऽप्यविरविकन्यायेनेति द्वन्द्वगर्भे तत्पुरुषे पूर्वसमासपूर्वपदस्थायाः सुपः — सुपो धातुप्रातिपदिकयोः (पा. II. 4. 71) इति प्रत्यक्षोपदिष्टोऽपि लुक् न कृतः ।' (p, 260. Ānan. ed.)

a verse from the Śāntiparva.[2295] It is most unlikely that an author will rely on his own work for supporting a proposition propounded in another work of his own. Besides, the Yogabhāṣya quotes on Y. S. I. 28 a verse, which is Viṣṇupurāṇa[2296] VI. 6. 2. The Viṣṇupurāṇa is one of the earliest among extant Purāṇas (vide above pp. 907–909) and cannot be assigned to a date later than the 3rd century A. D. Therefore, the Yogabhāṣya which quotes the Mahābhārata and the Viṣṇupurāṇa may be assigned to about 4th century A. D. As argued above, the Y. S. would therefore have to be assigned to a date not later than the 2nd or 3rd century A. D. Though the present writer holds that the Yoga that is said to be refuted in V. S. II. 1. 3 is not that of the Yogasūtra but the Yoga found in the Śāntiparva, yet he is not prepared to place the present Yogasūtra earlier than the 2nd century B. C. Mr. K. K. Kolhatkar in his very exhaustive and learned Introduction (in Marathi) asserts (on p. 126) that the Yogasūtra is later by 3000 years than the Brahmasūtra and that the Bhagavadgītā was composed about 5000 years before the present day (p. 224). But he adduces no evidence for such an ancient date for that work. He probably relies on the traditions that Vyāsa, the reputed author of the Mahābhārata (including the Gītā), flourished towards the end of the Dvāpara age and that Kaliyuga started in 3179 B. C. Modern critical scholarship does not accept these traditional datings.

Not only do some of the Upaniṣads contain references to Yoga technique and practices, but the Mahābhārata also dilates upon matters that pertain to the domain of Yoga. A few examples may be referred to here (the cr. ed. of the Mahābhārata is relied upon). In the Śāntiparva, chap. 232 (241 of Ch. ed.)

2295. सन्तोषादनुत्तमसुखलाभः। योगसूत्र II. 42. The only भाष्य on this is तथा चोक्तम्। यच्च कामसुखं लोके यच्च दिव्यं महत्सुखम्। तृष्णाक्षयसुखस्यैते नार्हतः षोडशीं कलाम्॥ इति. This Verse is शान्तिपर्व 171. 51 (cr. ed. =177. 51 of Ch. ed.) and वायु 93. 101; see p. 939 n. 1510 for this verse. On I. 47 'निर्विचारवैशारद्येऽध्यात्मप्रसादः' the भाष्य is : तथा चोक्तम्। प्रज्ञाप्रासादमारुह्य अशोच्यः शोचतो जनान्। भूमिष्ठानिव शैलस्थः सर्वान्प्राज्ञोऽनुपश्यति॥'. On this वाचस्पति remarks 'अत्रैव पारमर्षी गाथामुदाहरति'।.

2296. तज्जपस्तदर्थभावनम्। यो. सू. I. 28; तदस्य योगिनः प्रणवं जपतः प्रणवार्थं च भावयतश्चित्तमेकाग्रं सम्पद्यते। तथा चोक्तम्। स्वाध्यायाद्योगमासीत योगात्स्वाध्यायमामनेत्। स्वाध्याययोगसम्पत्त्या परमात्मा प्रकाशते इति. The printed विष्णुपु. reads 'आचरेत्' for आमनेत्, which latter is probably the older reading.

it is stated[2297] that kāma (desires), krodha (anger), lobha (covetousness), bhaya (fear) and svapna (sleep) are the five doṣas (disturbances), in the path of Yoga and then it prescribes means for mastering them. An important and striking assertion in that chapter is that even a person of the lowest *varṇa* (class) or a woman who is intent on dharma may reach the highest goal by following this path[2298] (of Yoga). The same chapter lays down (in verse 25) the proper places for the residence of a yogin and for the practice of Yoga, viz. untenanted mountains and caves, temples, vacant houses, in order that ekāgratā (one-pointedness of mind) may be achieved and that the yogin should treat in the same way a person who commends him or who speaks ill of him and should not contemplate the befalling of good or evil on any one. Chapter 289 of the Śāntiparva refers to Dhāraṇā (verse 37) and states that a yogin that has attained[2299] spiritual power may transfer himself to thousands of other bodies and move about in those bodies on the earth and that this path (of Yoga) is regarded as difficult of access even to wise brāhmaṇas and no one can tread it with ease and that one can stand easily on the sharp edges of razors, but to abide in Dhāraṇā of Yoga is difficult for those whose souls are not purified. Śāntiparva 304. 1 states that there is no knowledge equal to Sāṅkhya and no spiritual power equal to Yoga; it further says that Yoga is eightfold (verse 7) and in verse 9 mentions

---

2297. योगदोषान् समुच्छिद्य पञ्च यान् कवयो विदुः। कामं क्रोधं च लोभं च भयं स्वप्नं च पञ्चमम्॥ क्रोधं शमेन जयति कामं सङ्कल्पवर्जनात्। सत्त्वसंसेवनाद्धीरो निद्रामुच्छेत्तुमर्हति॥ अप्रमादाद्भयं जह्याल्लोभं प्रज्ञोपसेवनात्। शान्ति० 232. 4-7. In शान्ति० 289 (= 301 Ch. ed.) there is a dialogue between Bhīṣma and Yudhiṣṭhira in which the five doṣas are slightly different, viz. रागं मोहं तथा स्नेहं कामं क्रोधं च केवलम्। योगाच्छित्त्वादितो दोषान्पञ्चैतान् प्राप्नुवन्ति तत्। (verse 11). In chap. 290 (verses 53-54, cr. ed.) the five doṣas are कामक्रोधौ भयं निद्रा पञ्चमः श्वास उच्यते। एते दोषाः शरीरेषु दृश्यन्ते सर्वदेहिनाम्. The means of mastering them are the same as in chap. 232, but as to श्वास it is said 'छिन्दन्ति पञ्चमं श्वासं लघ्वाहारतया नृप (55)' Compare doṣas as in Āp. Dh. S. quoted on p. 1390.

2298. अपि वर्णावकृष्टस्तु नारी वा धर्मकाङ्क्षिणी। तावप्येतेन मार्गेण गच्छेतां परमां गतिम्॥ शान्ति० 232. 32.

2299. आत्मनां च सहस्राणि बहूनि भरतर्षभ। योगी कुर्याद्बलं प्राप्य तैश्च सर्वैर्महीं चरेत्। शान्ति 289. 26; this is quoted by Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. I. 3. 27 as smṛti and he remarks 'स्मृतिरपि ... एवं जातीयका प्राप्ताणिमाद्यैश्वर्याणां योगिनामपि युगपदनेकशरीरयोगं दर्शयति।'. दुर्गस्त्वेष मतः पन्था ब्राह्मणानां विपश्चिताम्। न कश्चिद् व्रजति ह्यस्मिन् क्षेमेण भरतर्षभ॥ सुस्थेयं क्षुरधारासु निशितासु महीपते। धारणासु तु योगस्य दुःस्थेयमकृतात्मभिः॥ शान्ति० 289. 50 and 54; compare क्षुरस्य धारा निशिता दुरत्यया दुर्गं पथस्तत् कवयो वदन्ति। कठोप. III. 14.

Dhāraṇā and Prāṇāyāma. The Āśvamedhikaparva 19. 17 (Ch. ed.) appears to refer to pratyāhāra.[2300]

There is also striking similarity between the Bhagavadgītā and the Yogasūtra.[2301] For example, the definition of Yoga in the Yogasūtra as the 'mastery over (or elimination of) the functions (or fluctuations) of the mind' has a close parallel in the Gītā. The Gītā insists on the yogin being 'aparigraha' (VI. 10); 'aparigṛha' is one of the five yamas (Y. S. II. 30). Similarly, the seat and posture (āsana) in which a yogin is to practise must be stable (this refers to the seat) and comfortable (says Yogasūtra); the Gītā says the same thing in greater detail. In VIII. 12 the Gītā speaks of Yogadhāraṇā. The Gītā says (in VI. 35) that the mind is certainly restless and difficult to control, but it can be controlled by practice and passionlessness and the Y. S. (I. 12) speaks of the same two means. The Gītā (in V. 4-5) emphasizes that it is the ignorant that regard Sāṅkhya and Yoga as different, that he who applies himself or stands committed to one of these secures the fruit held out by both and that he who sees both ways as identical sees truly. Here Sāṅkhya means (sannyāsa) 'renunciatien' and Yoga means 'Karmayoga'.

The Yogasūtra of Patañjali nowhere expressly sets out its scheme of the evolution of the world. But it contains enough material to enable us to hold that it presupposes and accepts some of the Sāṅkhya doctrines such as the theory of Pradhāna, the three guṇas and their characteristics, the real nature of the individual self and *kaivalya* (the state of the soul in final liberation). This may be established by a few references to Y. S. Y. S. III. 48 describes the results that ensue to the yogin from subjugation or mastery of the organs (*indriyas*), one of which is

---

2300. Compare 'स्वविषयासंप्रयोगे चित्तस्वरूपानुकार इवेन्द्रियाणां प्रत्याहारः ।' योगसूत्र II. 54. Vide also शान्ति 232. 13 मनसश्चेन्द्रियाणां च कृत्वैकाग्र्यं समाहितः । प्राग्रात्रापररात्रेषु धारयेन्मन आत्मना ॥

2301. योगश्चित्तवृत्तिनिरोधः । योगसूत्र I. 2; compare गीता VI. 20 यत्रोपरमते चित्तं निरुद्धं योगसेवया; स्थिरसुखमासनम् । योगसूत्र II. 46; compare गीता VI. 11-13 शुचौ देशे प्रतिष्ठाप्य स्थिरमासनमात्मनः । नात्युच्छ्रितं नातिनीचं चैलाजिनकुशोत्तरम् ॥ ... समं कायशिरोग्रीवं धारयन्नचलं स्थिरः ।; असंशयं महाबाहो मनो दुर्निग्रहं चलम् । अभ्यासेन तु कौन्तेय वैराग्येण च गृह्यते ॥ गीता VI. 35; compare 'अभ्यासवैराग्याभ्यां तन्निरोधः ।' योगसूत्र I. 12.

'*pradhānajaya*'[2302] (subjugation of Pradhāna, the primary cause of the world according to the Sāṅkhya). The Y. S. nowhere describes what Pradhāna is and what its evolutes are. Therefore, it follows that it takes over from the Sāṅkhya all that is said about Pradhāna. About the individual soul the Y. S. states 'the seer (Puruṣa) exists[2303] as merely pure capacity of awareness (or as the mere power of seeing) and although pure (changeless or undefiled or free from any taints) appears as if he sees all experiences (that really pertain to Buddhi).' The characteristics of the three guṇas (sattva, rajas and tamas) are clearly and succintly[2304] stated in Y. S. as in S. Kārikā 13, when it says 'the seen (phenomenal universe) is characterized by light (sattva), activity (rajas) and inertia or dullness (tamas), it is the essence of the elements and organs and it exists for the purpose of giving experience and liberation (to the soul)'. The *guṇas* are frequently referred to in Y. S. I. 16, IV. 13, 32, 34 and *sattvaguṇa* in Y. S. II. 41, III. 35, 49 and 55. The Y. S. postulates three *pramāṇas* (in I. 7), but does not define them; the S. Kārikā (4-6) mentions the same three pramāṇas and briefly defines them. They both agree about the plurality of souls It may further be noted that Vyāsabhāṣya on Y. S. is full of Sāṅkhya doctrines and quotes, according to Vācaspati, Pañcaśikha twelve times and Ṣaṣṭitantra once (vide above p. 1374 and n. 2250).

In spite of the fact that the Yogasūtra accepts some of the fundamental doctrines of the Sāṅkhya, there are certain points of difference between the two. The standard Sāṅkhya finds no place for God (Īśvara) i. e. it is frankly atheistic (if theism means belief in God who is the creator of the universe and regulator of rewards and punishments), while Yoga finds a place for God in Y. S. I. 23-29, though not a basic one, but only secondary, probably as a concession to popular feelings and belief. The

---

2302. ततो मनोजवित्वं विकरणाभावः प्रधानजयश्च। यो. सू. III. 48. These are three perfections. On प्रधानजय, the व्यासभाष्य remarks 'सर्वप्रकृतिविकारवशित्वं... प्रधानजयः। इति एतास्तिस्रः सिद्धयो मधुप्रतीका उच्यन्ते।'.

2303. द्रष्टा दृशिमात्रः शुद्धोऽपि प्रत्ययानुपश्यः। यो. सू. II. 20; व्यासभाष्य explains 'प्रत्ययानुपश्यो यतः प्रत्ययं बौद्धमनुपश्यति। तमनुपश्यन्नतदात्मापि तदात्मक इव प्रत्यवभासते'. Compare सां. कारिका 19 तस्माच्च विपर्यासात्सिद्धं साक्षित्वमस्य पुरुषस्य। कैवल्यं माध्यस्थ्यं द्रष्टृत्वमकर्तृभावश्च॥.

2304. प्रकाश-क्रिया-स्थितिशीलं भूतेन्द्रियात्मकं भोगापवर्गार्थं दृश्यम्। यो. सू. II. 18; प्रकाशशीलं सत्त्वं क्रियाशीलं रजः स्थितिशीलं तम इति। एते गुणाः ... प्रधानशब्दवाच्या भवन्ति। एतद् दृश्यमित्युच्यते। व्यासभाष्य; compare सां. कारिका 13 सत्त्वं लघु° quoted in note 2215 p. 1357.

Y. S. nowhere expressly says that Īśvara is the creator of the world and all that it says about Him is that in him omniscience is at its highest, that He was the teacher of primal sages and that by repetition of the mystic syllable 'om' and reflection on it the yogin attains correct knowledge of the real nature of the self. In the next place, though the *summum bonum* in both systems is called *kaivalya* (S. Kārikā 64, 68 and Y. S. III. 50, 55, IV. 34), yet the Sāṅkhya does not set out any elaborate discipline for attaining it except correct knowledge, that is, it is metaphysical and rational, while the Y. S. gives an elaborate treatment on mind discipline, insists on effort rather than mere jñāna, attaches great importance to prāṇāyāma and meditation (dhyāna) and is psychological.

The Sāṅkhya postulated that an intellectual understanding of the nature of *puruṣa* and of *prakṛti* (or *guṇas*) and of the difference between the two was sufficient for the emancipation of the individual self from the liability to rebirth, while yoga, on the other hand, was not content with this philosophic easy-going mental frame and emphasized systematic training of the will and emotions. In both Sāṅkhya and Yoga each individual soul is eternal and his destiny is to become free from the influence of Prakṛti *and its evolutes and to remain for ever the same* (*viz.* pure intelligence). Herein they differ from the Advaita Vedānta, according to which the final destiny of the self is to become absorbed in and one with *brahma*.

There is another matter for consideration. In the Yājñavalkya-smṛti, Yājñavalkya is put forward as saying that the soul shining like a lamp in the heart should be realized, that on such realization the soul is not born again and as adding that for the purpose of attaining to Yoga one should understand the Āraṇyaka[2305] which 'I received from the Sun and also the

---

2305. ज्ञेयं चारण्यकमहं यदादित्यादवाप्तवान्। योगशास्त्रं च मत्प्रोक्तं ज्ञेयं योगमभीप्सता॥ या. III. 110; याज्ञवल्क्यो महायोगी दृष्ट्वात्र तपसा हरम्। चकार तन्नियोगेन कायशास्त्रमनुत्तमम्॥ कूर्म I. 25. 44 (=B. I. ed. p. 269). एह्यास्स्व व्याख्यास्यामि ते व्याचक्षाणस्य तु मे निदिध्यासस्वेति। ... आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः। बृह. उप. II. 4. 4–5. Compare बृह. उप. IV. 5. 5–6 for the same words and वे. सू. IV. 1. 1 for this Bṛ. Up. passage as the basis along with छा. उप. VIII. 7. 1 'य आत्मापहतपाप्मा ... सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः स विजिज्ञासितव्यः' of that topic in V. S. It is not unlikely that Yāj. III. 110 is an early interpolation, but since all commentators from Viśvarūpa downwards treat it as authentic, one has to accept it as a genuine part of Yāj. smṛti until some explicit evidence to the contrary is forthcoming.

Yogaśāstra propounded by me.' In the Kūrmapurāṇa it is said that Yājñavalkya composed Yogaśāstra at the order of Hara and the Viṣṇupurāṇa (IV. 4 107) states that Hiraṇyanābha attained the knowledge of Yoga from the great Yogīśvara Yājñavalkya who was a pupil of Jaimini. In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up. (II. 4) Yājñavalkya tells his wife Maitreyī (who hankered after immortality and cared naught for worldly goods) that he would expound to her the path to immortality and the very first sentence calls upon her to cultivate 'nididhyāsa' (i. e. dhyāna) and the first part of his discourse ends with the memorable words (ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavyaḥ, Bṛ. Up. II. 4. 5). What work is meant by the Yogaśāstra composed by Yāj. is a debatable point. There are three works (other than the Yāj. smṛti) connected with the name of Yājñavalkya viz. ... Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya, Yoga-Yājñavalkya and Bṛhad-yogi-yājñavalkya (vide H. of Dh. vol. I. p. 188–190). The last has been published by Kaivalyadhama, Lonavla (1951), the Yoga-Yāj. was published in T. S. S. (1938) based on a single ms., then in the JBBRAS (vol. 28 and 29) by Shri P. C. Diwanji and now available in book form (1954). This last is in the form of a dialogue between the great yogin Yājñavalkya and Gārgī (who is identified with Maitreyī by Shri Diwanji on pp. 27–28 of his ed. of 1954) and sages and learned brāhmaṇas. Yājñavalkya narrates what he learnt from Brahmā. On Yāj. III. 110 the Dīpakalikā of Śūlapāṇi remarks that the Yogaśāstra referred to is called 'Yogiyājñavalkya'. But this again leads to uncertainty as both the works viz. that published by Kaivalyadhama and the one by Mr. Diwanji are so referred to as Yogī (or Yoga) Yājñavalkya in several digests. Mr. Diwanji[2306] tries hard to establish that the work published by him 'has a better claim to be adjudged the specific work on Yoga referred to in Yāj. III. 113.' I think that the claim is not at all justified. The work edited by Mr. Diwanji no doubt contains a good deal of Yoga knowledge; while the work published by Kaivalyadhama also contains a good deal of Yoga material, though not as much as the work edited by Mr. Diwanji contains. It would be irrelevant to discuss here all the points made by Mr. Diwanji. The present author is convinced that the work sponsored by Mr. Diwanji is not the work referred to by Yājñavalkya (in his smṛti III. 110). It is a compilation of a later period. Some striking

2306. Vide Shri P. C. Diwanji's lengthy paper on 'Bṛhad-Yogī Yājñavalkya and Yoga-Yājñavalkya' in ABORI vol. 34 pp. 1–29.

matters alone may be pointed out to show that the Yoga-Yājñavalkya could not have been the work of the author of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and the Yogaśāstra (as stated in Yāj. III. 110) and of Yāj. smṛti. In the Bṛ. Up. II. 4. 1 and IV. 5. 1 (Yājñavalkyasya dve bhārye babhūvatur–Maitreyī ca Kātyāyanī ca) it is expressly stated that Yājñavalkya had two wives, (philosophy-minded) Maitreyī and Kātyāyanī (worldly-minded). Maitreyī desired such knowledge as would lead to immortality and she asks questions, in all of which she addresses Yājñavalkya as 'bhagavān' (in Bṛ. Up. II. 4. 3 and 13 and IV. 5. 4, 14) and never as mere Yājñavalkya. On the other hand, Gārgī in the Bṛ. Up. is called Vācaknavī (in III. 6. 1, III. 8.1 and 12), is not Yājñavalkya's wife but a pert and rationalistic woman inquirer like Aśvala, Ārtabhāga, Bhujyu Lāhyāyani, Uṣasta Cākrāyaṇa, Kahola (all present in the court of Janaka), who including Gārgī questioned the claim of Yājñavalkya to be regarded as 'brahmiṣṭha'. In Bṛ. Up. III. 6. 1 when Gārgī pursues her ratiocination too far (in matters depending upon āgama and being beyond reasoning) Yājñavalkya reprimands her and says that she would die (lit. her head would fall away) if she pursued the subject in a pure logistic way. All those inquirers address Yājñavalkya as mere Yājñavalkya without any honorific epithet like 'bhagavān' and Gārgī does the same (in Bṛ. Up. III. 6. 1, III. 8. 2–6). Acc. to Yāj. Smṛti III. 110 the Bṛ. Up., a Yoga-śāstra and the smṛti are the works of one man (whose two wives were Maitreyī and Kātyāyanī) and who had a philosophical skirmish with Gārgī Vācaknavī (according to the Bṛ. Up.). The present Yogayājñavalkya (ed. by Mr. Diwanji) makes Gārgī wife of Yājñavalkya[2307] (vadhūḥ). One would like to know whether Yāj. had three wives, as Bṛ. Up. says he had only two. Mr. Diwanji (pp. 27-28 of the ed. of 1954) tries to make light of this discrepancy and regards Maitreyī as another name of Gārgī. We are here concerned not with pure Yoga doctrines but with the question

---

2307. The योगया. I. 6–7 are तमेवंगुणसंपन्नं नारीणामुत्तमा वधूः। मैत्रेयी च महाभागा गार्गी च ब्रह्मविद्वरा॥ सभामध्यगता चेयमृषीणामुग्रतेजसाम्। प्रणम्य दण्डवद्भूमौ गार्ग्येतद् वाक्यमब्रवीत्॥. The two चs may be noted; that would ordinarily show that मैत्रेयी and गार्गी were different. It might be argued that having already learnt from Yāj. (in Bṛ. Up.) Maitreyī was present but took no part in the discussion and Gārgī alone asked questions. Verse 6 of chap. I could be considered as using the words उत्तमा वधूः for मैत्रेयी and the words महाभागा and ब्रह्मविद्वरा as applicable to गार्गी; but this is made impossible by the text which in I. 43 and IV. 5 refers to Gārgī as the wife (bhāryā) of Yāj. and she is addressed as 'priye' (IV. 7), 'varārohe' etc.

whether a work attributed to Yāj. which makes Gārgī the wife of the ancient Yājñavalkya (when the Upaniṣad makes her only a more or less insolent woman) can be regarded as the work of the same Yāj. who propounded *brahmavidyā* in the Bṛ. Up. and is supposed to have composed the Yāj. smṛti. This one circumstance alone is enough to brand the Yoga-Yājñavalkya (of Mr. Diwanji) as a fabrication sought to be passed off as an ancient work. If identity was really meant the verse could easily have been read as 'Maitreyyākhyā mahābhāgā' without any metrical fault. Therefore, it is not possible to hold that Yogayājñavalkya is the Yogaśāstra composed by Yājñavalkya before the Smṛti going under his name was composed. A few other decisive grounds may also be urged. The work edited by Mr. Diwanji mentions Tantras (in V. 10) and Tāntrikas (in VIII. 4 and 25). The Yāj. smṛti nowhere mentions these two and is free from the peculiar Tāntrik words or technique. Therefore, the present Yogayājñavalkya edited by Mr. Diwanji was composed long after the Yāj. smṛti and probably in the 8th century or after when Tāntrik rites and works had become common. One more important matter may be adverted to. The Yāj. smṛti and the Yoga-Yājñavalkya (ed. by Mr. Diwanji) both enumerate ten *yamas* and ten *niyamas*. But the two diverge materially in the ten names as the note below will show.[2308] The number of yamas and niyamas differs in different works, but if the Yāj. smṛti and Yoga-Yājñavalkya were the works of the same author, the differences in the ten names would not have occurred at all. Therefore, the author of the Yāj. smṛti is quite different from the author of the Y. Y. There is no evidence for holding that the latter flourished before the 8th or 9th century A. D.

A good deal has been said by Mr. Diwanji in his paper on 'Bṛhad-yogi-yājñavalkya and Yoga-Yājñavalkya' in ABORI, vol. XXXIV (1953) pp. 1-29, in his preface to Yoga-Yājñavalkya in JBBRAS, volumes XXXVIII and XXXIX pp. 103-106 and by Swami Kuvalayanand in his reply in ABORI, vol. XXXVII for

---

2308. ब्रह्मचर्यं दया क्षान्तिर्दानं सत्यमकल्कता। अहिंसास्तेयमाधुर्ये दमश्चेति यमाः स्मृताः॥ स्नानं मौनोपवासेज्या स्वाध्यायोपस्थनिग्रहाः। नियमा गुरुशुश्रूषा शौचाक्रोधाप्रमादता॥ या. III. 312-313 ; compare अहिंसा सत्यमस्तेयं ब्रह्मचर्यं दयार्जवम्। क्षमा धृतिर्मिताहारः शौचं त्वेते यमा दश॥ तपः सन्तोष आस्तिक्यं दानमीश्वरपूजनम्। सिद्धान्तश्रवणं चैव ह्रीर्मतिश्च जपो व्रतम्। एते तु नियमाः प्रोक्तास्तांश्च सर्वान् पृथक् पृथक्। योगयाज्ञ. I. 50-51. The striking dissimilarities between the two are: शौच is a नियम acc. to या. स्मृ. but a यम acc. to योगया and there are other notable additions and omissions which any reader will find.

1957 pp. 279–289 and in the paper 'the real Yogayājñavalkya-smṛti' in the journal 'Yogamīmāṁsā' vol. VII. No. 2 (and also published separately as a pamphlet in July 1958). It would not be relevant in this work to discuss the points in dispute between Mr. Diwanji and Swami Kuvalayanand. In the bhāṣya on the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad attributed to Śaṅkarācārya [2309] (published by Ānan. Press) on p. 28 four verses and a half are quoted from Yogi–Yājñavalkya, none of which is found either in Bṛ. Y. Y. or Y. Y. Besides on Śv. Up. II. 9 (pp. 42–44) 29 verses on Yoga matters are quoted in the bhāṣya, but the name of the author or work whence the quotations are taken is not mentioned. Not one of the 29 verses wholly occurs in Mr. Diwanji's Y. Y. He is able to point out only five or six half verses as occurring in Y. Y. out of the 29 verses, while a whole verse quoted in the bhāṣya (viz. 'prāṇāyāmair' &c) occurs in Bṛ. Y. Y. (8. 32). It may be further pointed out that Aparārka and the Smṛticandrikā quote in all about 100 verses from Yogi (or Yoga–) Yājñavalkya which are found in Bṛ. Y. Y., but not in Y. Y. The Kṛtyakalpataru (on Mokṣakāṇḍa alone) quotes (on pp. 146, 149, 166, 171, 196–197) about 70 verses from Yogi-yājñavalkya which are found in chapters 2, 8, 9 and 11 of the Bṛ. Y. Y. Mr. Diwanji has not been able to show that verses of the Y. Y. (ed. by him) are cited anywhere in the above three digests. Mr. Bhabatosh Bhattacarya in his paper on Yogi-Yājñavalkya-smṛti and its utilization in the medieval digests of Bengal and Mithilā (in J. G. J. R. I. vol. XV for 1958 pp. 135–140) points out that king Ballālasena of Bengal (1158–1179 A. D.) in his Dānasāgara contains a fairly large number of quotations from the Bṛhad-Yogi Yāj. (pub. by Kaivalya-dhama). It appears that Viśvarūpa [2310] (first half of 9th century A.D.) quotes a half verse from the Bṛ. Y. Y. and remarks that the work is composed by the author of the Yāj.

2309. The authenticity of the bhāṣya as the great Śaṅkarācārya's work is extremely doubtful. In the whole of the extensive bhāṣya on the Brahmasūtra Śaṅkarācārya quotes no Purāṇa by name but cites only a very few verses with the words 'iti purāṇe'. But in the bhāṣya on the Śv. Up. of only 76 printed pages over 30 verses from Brahmapurāṇa, about 30 verses from Viṣṇupurāṇa, about a dozen from the Liṅgapurāṇa and about half a dozen verses from the Śivadharmottara (on pp. 7, 34, 35) are cited.

2310. On स्नानमब्दैवतैर्मन्त्रैर्मार्जनं प्राणसंयमः। या. स्मृति I. 22, विश्वरूप comments "स्नानं प्रत्यहं कुर्यात्। तस्य च विधिराचार्येणैवान्यत्राभिहितः, विद्यमाने प्रभूते हि नाल्पे स्नानं समाचरेत्" इति. Compare बृह. यो. या. VII. 6 'प्रभूते विद्यमाने तु उदके सुमनोहरे'; अपरार्क p. 235 (योगयाज्ञवल्क्य) प्रभूते ... हरे। नाल्पोदके द्विजः स्नायात्) and स्मृतिच. I. p. 129 reads as अपरार्क does.

smṛti himself. Therefore, the Bṛ. Y.Y. is an early work and cannot be assigned to a date later than the 7th century A. D.; while Y. Y. is a much later compilation composed in the 8th or 9th century or even later. The present author is not, however, prepared to hold that Bṛ. Y. Y. is the Yogaśāstra of Yāj. mentioned in Yāj. smṛti III. 110, since the Yoga material contained in it is meagre as compared with the Smṛti material. The present author is glad to find that on pp. 7-8 of the Sanskrit Preface to the edition of the Bṛhad-Yogi-Yājñavalkya-smṛti the editors express grave doubts about the identity of the author of the Yāj. smṛti with the author of the work edited by them.

The Yogavāsiṣṭha is an extensive work in 32000 Ślokas (one śloka meaning 32 syllables) printed in two volumes with a commentary by Ānandabodha by the Nirn. Press. It is really an eclectic work embodying[2311] the tenets of the Gītā on *anāsakti*, the tenets of the Trika system of Kashmir, of Advaita Vedānta &c. Its text appears to have been added to from time to time. Controversies have raged about its date and its contribution to Indian philosophy. The present writer holds on reading the contributions[2312] that the extant Yogavāsiṣṭha is a late work and was composed some time between the 11th and 13th century A. D.

It is now necessary to furnish a brief outline of the main teachings of Y. S. Though the work is comparatively small, its rendering in English requires to be amplified in order that it may be understandable. Only the most important and instructive matters are set out here.

Yoga is defined (2nd sūtra) as the elimination of or mastery over the functions (activities) or fluctuations of the mind. This is provisionally explained by Vyāsa (on I. 1.) as

2311. Though there is not much compact teaching on pure Yoga, the योगवासिष्ठ here and there has remarks on योग. For example, the उपशमप्रकरण chap. 78 verse 8 states: द्वौ क्रमौ चित्तनाशस्य योगो ज्ञानं च राघव । योगस्तद्वृत्तिरोधो हि ज्ञानं सम्यगवेक्षणम् ॥.

2312. Vide Dr. Atreya's thesis on the 'Philosophy of Yogavāsiṣṭha' published in 1936 at Adyar by the Theosophic Publishing House (he holds that it belongs to 6th century A. D.); I. H. Q. vol. 24 pp. 201-212 (Prof. S. P. Bhattacharya), I. H. Q. vol. 25 pp. 132-134 (Dr. D. C. Sarkar); Mr. Diwanji's papers in Pro. of 7th All India O. Conf. pp. 15-30, P. O. III. 1 pp. 29-44, N. I. A. vol. I pp. 697-715 (on Laghu-yogavāsiṣṭha), JOR. Mad. vol. XIII. pp. 71-82 and 118-128 (Dr. Raghavan), ABORI vol. 32 pp. 130-145.

Samādhi. The different stages viz. (bhūmis) of the mind are five, being restless (kṣipta), infatuated (mugdha or mūḍha), distracted (vikṣipta), one-pointed (ekāgra) and controlled (niruddha).

In this connection (i. e. on the topic of bhūmis) the present author has to bring to the notice of readers a paper by Shri Kuvalayānanda contributed to the Yogamīmāṁsā vol. VI. No. 4 on 'Traditional reading of Pātañjala-yogasūtra III. 11; is it accurate.' The traditional reading accepted by the bhāṣya of Vyāsa and all other commentators is 'Sarvārthataikāgratayoḥ kṣayodayau cittasya samādhipariṇāmaḥ'. The Svami[2314] argues that the correct reading should be '*sarvārthataikārthayoḥ* &c.' He states that the bhūmis should be six, the sixth being 'ekārtha' and bases his arguments on the combined explanations of Yogasūtra I. 2–4, 18 and III. 9–12. All that the present writer can say is that his arguments deserve serious consideration. The fact that even Vyāsa, the bhāṣyakāra of Yogasūtra, would have to be held not to have seen the difficulties in the traditional reading of Y. S. III. 11 would have to be given due weight before any final conclusion can be arrived at. That sūtra states the goal of Yoga viz. the soul that is seer abides in its own form then (i. e. when the functions of the mind have been mastered), while in ordinary life the soul appears to assume the forms of the fluctuations of the mind. The Vṛttis[2315] are five, some of which are

---

2314. योगश्चित्तवृत्तिनिरोधः। तदा द्रष्टुः स्वरूपेऽवस्थानम्। वृत्तिसारूप्यमितरत्र। यो. सू. I. 2. 4; it would be interesting to note some definitions of yoga from other works: विषयेभ्यो निवर्त्याभिप्रेतेऽर्थे मनसोऽवस्थापनं योगः। देवल-धर्मसूत्र q. in note 2263, p. 1380 above; वृत्तिहीनं मनः कृत्वा क्षेत्रज्ञं (०ज्ञः v. l.) परमात्मनि। एकीकृत्य विमुच्येत योगोयं मुख्य उच्यते॥ दक्षस्मृति VII. 15; आत्मप्रयत्नसापेक्षा विशिष्टा या मनोगतिः। तस्या ब्रह्मणि संयोगो योग इत्यभिधीयते॥ विष्णुपु. VI. 7. 31. All three are q. by अपरार्क (on या. III. 109) p. 986 and by कृत्यकल्प० (on मोक्ष) p. 165. अपरार्क himself says 'जीवपरमात्मनोरभेदविज्ञानं विषयान्तरासम्भिन्नं योगः'.

2315. वृत्तयः पञ्चतय्यः क्लिष्टाक्लिष्टाः। प्रमाणविपर्ययविकल्पनिद्रास्मृतयः। प्रत्यक्षानुमानागमाः प्रमाणानि। ... अभावप्रत्ययालम्बना वृत्तिर्निद्रा। अनुभूतविषयासंप्रमोषः स्मृतिः। यो. सू. I, 5–7 and 10–11. The क्लेशs (hindrances or obstacles) are five, viz. अविद्या-अस्मिता-राग-द्वेष-अभिनिवेशाः क्लेशाः (यो. सू. II. 3). The भाष्य on I. 8 is 'सेयं पञ्चपर्वा भवत्यविद्या अविद्यास्मिता... निवेशाः क्लेशा इति। एत एव स्वसंज्ञाभिस्तमो मोहो महामोहस्तामिस्रोऽन्धतामिस्र इति।'. अविद्या has five aspects (lit. joints) viz. अविद्या etc. which are respectively called मोह etc ; वाचस्पति explains all these. About अस्मिता he says योगिनामष्टस्वणिमादिकेष्वैश्वर्येष्वश्रेयःसु श्रेयोबुद्धिरष्टविधो मोहः पूर्वस्मादजघन्यः। स च्वास्मितोच्यते।'. The बुद्धचरित XII. 33 has these technical ideas: 'इत्यविद्या हि विद्वांसः पञ्चपर्वा समीहते। तमो मोहं महामोहं तामिस्रद्वयमेव च॥'. They are so called because they afflict men plunged in *Saṁsāra* with several kinds of suffering. 'अविद्यादयः क्लेशाः क्लिश्नन्ति खल्वमी पुरुषं सांसारिकं विविधदुःखप्रहारेणेति' वाचस्पति on यो. सू. I. 24).

afflicted by hindrances called *kleśas* and the others are not so hindered (those that are hindered are to be mastered or eliminated and the others are to be accepted). The five *vṛttis* are *pramāṇa* (means of valid knowledge), *viparyaya* (wrong conception), *vikalpa* (fancy), *nidrā* (sleep),[2316] *smṛti* (memory). Pramāṇas are three, *pratyakṣa* (perception), *anumāna* (inference), *āgama* (verbal testimony). The means for the suppression of the vṛttis are *abhyāsa* (practice) and *vairāgya* (passionlessness) (simultaneously carried on), the first being the effort to secure a calm flow of the mind free from vṛttis, continued for a long time uninterruptedly and earnestly and the latter (vairāgya) being the consciousness of mastery over (i. e. freedom from thirst for) seen objects (such as woman, food and drink, high position) and objects promised by Revelation (such as heaven, disembodied existence &c.).[2317] 'Vairāgya is of two kinds *apara* (described in Y. S. I. 15 just above) and *para* (highest) described in Y. S. I. 16 and bhāṣya thereon. In the highest *vairāgya* the yogin (who has reached discrimination between the self and the *guṇas*, sattva &c.) is free from thirst not only for objects of sense, but also free from the guṇas, attains a stage of undisturbed consciousness only and leads the yogin to reflect 'I have attained what was to be attained, the kleśas (hindrances

---

2316. According to the Yogabhāṣya on Y. S. I. 10 sleep is a special positive idea or experience (*pratyaya*) and not a mere absence of any activities or fluctuations of the mind, since when a man rises from sleep he reflects 'I have slept well, my mind is happy and makes my intellect clear' and this reflection on waking would not be possible if there had been no experience (during sleep) of the cause of such a feeling. Just as in *samādhi* one has to master other ideas (viz. misconception, fancy &c.), so the Yogi has to master sleep also as a hindrance to the attainment of Samādhi.

2317. अभ्यासवैराग्याभ्यां तन्निरोधः। तत्र स्थितौ यत्नोऽभ्यासः। स तु दीर्घकाल-नैरन्तर्यसत्कारासेवितो दृढभूमिः। दृष्टानुश्रविकविषयवितृष्णस्य वशीकारसंज्ञा वैराग्यम्। तत्परं पुरुषख्यातेर्गुणवैतृष्ण्यम्। यो. सू. I. 12-16. On sūtra I. 15 the bhāṣya says 'स्त्रियोऽन्नपानमैश्वर्यमिति दृष्टविषये विरक्तस्य स्वर्गवैदेह्यप्रकृतिलयत्वप्राप्तावानुश्रविकवितृ-ष्णस्य दिव्यादिव्यविषयसंप्रयोगेऽपि चित्तस्य विषयदोषदर्शिनः प्रसंख्यानबलादनाभोगात्मिका हेयोपादेयशून्या वशीकारसंज्ञा वैराग्यम्।'; वाचस्पति explains 'अनुश्रवो वेदस्ततोऽधि-गताः आनुश्रविकाः स्वर्गादयः। ...... न वैतृष्ण्यमात्रं वैराग्यं, अपि तु दिव्यादिव्यविषय-संप्रयोगेऽपि चित्तस्यानाभोगात्मिका।' For the words दृष्ट and आनुश्रविक, compare सां. का. 2 दृष्टवदानुश्रविकः स ह्यविशुद्धिक्षयातिशययुक्तः। तद्विपरीतः श्रेयान् व्यक्ताव्यक्तज्ञ-विज्ञानात्॥'. The भाष्य on I. 16 remarks 'तद्द्वयं वैराग्यम्। तत्र यदुत्तरं तज्ज्ञान-प्रसादमात्रम्। ... ज्ञानस्यैव पराकाष्ठा वैराग्यम्। एतस्यैव हि नान्तरीयकं कैवल्यमिति।'. In this 2nd kind of vairāgya there is nothing but an undisturbed and calm consciousness or knowledge (unconnected with any object whatever) and *Kaivalya* (the goal of yoga) is inseparably connected with it.

avidyā &c.) that have to be destroyed have been destroyed, the close-knit succession of births and deaths has been cut off'. The Bhāṣya remarks 'the highest limit of consciousness (knowledge) is Vairāgya and Kaivalya is inseparably connected with it.' Vācaspati states that this last is called 'Dharmamegha-samādhi' (mentioned in Y. S. IV. 29). Sūtras 17 and 18 of first pāda deal respectively with samprajñāta-*samādhi (conscious concentration)* or sālambanasamādhi *and* asamprajñāta-samādhi (concentration in which there is no consciousness of objects, gross or subtle). The first is of four kinds (or of four stages) viz. *savitarka* (deliberation over or realization of a gross object like Śālagrāma or the image of a god with four arms and the like), *savicāra* (where there is reflection over a subtle object such as the *tan-mātrās*), *sānanda* where the reflection is on the mind which is full of sattva (that is a samādhi of joy) and *sāsmitarūpa* (i. e. where there is only a sense of personality in which the knower himself is the object of perception).[2318] These four kinds lead on to the asamprajñāta-samādhi, which results when all vṛttis have disappeared, when there is persistent exercise of this state and the mind consists of sub-liminal impressions only. Sūtras 19-51 (to the end of the first *pāda*) deal with the different kinds of samādhi, the different ways of attainment, the position of Īśvara in the Yoga system, the nine obstacles (antarāya) that cause distraction of the mind of the person who practises Yoga and the companions of these

---

2318. वितर्कविचारानन्दास्मितानुगमात् संप्रज्ञातः। विरामप्रत्ययाभ्यासपूर्वः संस्कारशेषोऽन्यः। यो. सू. I. 17–18. These two are called सबीज and निर्बीज or सालम्बन and निरालम्बन or सविकल्प and निर्विकल्प समाधि. The भाष्य on I. 18 states तदभ्यासपूर्वकं हि चित्तं निरालम्बनमभावप्राप्तमिव भवतीत्येष निर्बीजः समाधिः. The भाष्य on यो. सू. I. 2 states 'स निर्बीजः समाधिः। न तत्र किंचित्संप्रज्ञायत इत्यसंप्रज्ञातः। द्विविधः स योगश्चित्तवृत्तिनिरोध इति।'. अस्मिता is one of five क्लेश s (vide n. 2315 above) and avidyā is said to be the root of four out of five kleśas (II. 4), and II. 6 defines 'asmitā as the identification of the seer (the self) and the instrument of seeing i. e. buddhi'. It is somewhat surprising that one kind of samādhi is characterized by 'asmitā'. Probably asmitā here means no more than the conciousness 'I am' (*i. e. of personality*). It is *remarkable that* Buddhist texts exhibit a close parallel to the four kinds of संप्रज्ञातसमाधि (vide मज्झिमनिकाय vol. I pp. 21–22 Trenckner's ed. of 1888). 'सो खो अहं ब्राह्मण विविच्चेव कामेहि विविच्च अकुसलेहि धम्मेहि सवितक्कं सविचारं विवेकजं पीतिसुखं पठमं झानं उपसम्पज्ज विहासिं। etc. पीति (प्रीति) is the same as आनन्द in the योगसूत्र. Dr. B. C. Law's paper on 'Prince Jeta's Grove in Ancient India' (J. I. H. vol. XXXVII, Part III, December 1959 p. 353 note 94) brought to my notice this close correspondence and he kindly furnished the reference to the Majjhimanikāya.

obstacles, the means of preventing obstacles &c. such as practice of concentration on a single entity, the cultivation of friendliness, compassion, joy (towards holy men), indifference (towards unholy men) or by prāṇāyāma.

The Pātañjalasūtra (in I. 19-23) divides yogins for asamprajñāta-samādhi into various categories (nine in all), which are passed over here. Patañjali says that asamprajñāta-samādhi in the case of yogins (who are not gods or not those whose bodies are resolved into primary matter) follows upon that practice which effects the cessation of all vṛttis and which comprises only subliminal consciousness and is preceded by faith, perfect repose or serenity, energy, mindfulness and discriminatory insight (into what is real) due to passionlessness. It would be noticed that so far Patañjali asks the aspirant for Yoga to rely on his own efforts, practice &c. He does not mention God or his grace anywhere so far. From this it follows that any man or woman and even one who is an agnostic may pursue yogic practices and attain to asamprajñāta-samādhi and liberation without devotion to God or without God's grace. But Patañjali as a keen psychologist knew the help that faith affords. Therefore, he provides that, if you believe in God, He will help you in the practice of Yoga and from that point of view he assigns to Īśvara a role of a limited scope.

In Y. S. I. 23-28 Patañjali provides that Samādhi and liberation (the result of Samādhi) may also be secured by [2319]

2319. ईश्वरप्रणिधानाद्वा । क्लेशकर्मविपाकाशयैरपरामृष्टः पुरुषविशेष ईश्वरः । तत्र निरतिशयं सर्वज्ञत्वबीजम् । स पूर्वेषामपि गुरुः कालेनानवच्छेदात् । तस्य वाचकः प्रणवः । तज्जपस्तदर्थभावनम् । ततः प्रत्यक्चेतनाधिगमोऽप्यन्तरायाभावश्च । यो. सू. I. 23-29. ईश्वरप्रणिधान is explained in two ways by the व्यासभाष्य (1) special devotion (भक्तिविशेष on I. 23) and (2) offering up of all actions to the Supreme Teacher (Īśvara) or the renunciation of the fruits of all actions (ईश्वरप्रणिधानं सर्वक्रियाणां परमगुरावर्पणं तत्फलसंन्यासो वा । on II. 1). The भावागणेशवृत्ति on this quotes कूर्मपुराण for the meaning of ब्रह्मार्पण 'नाहं कर्ता सर्वमेतद् ब्रह्मैव कुरुते तथा । एतद् ब्रह्मार्पणं प्रोक्तमृषिभिस्तत्त्वदर्शिभिः ॥'. The यो. सू. (I. 22-23 and II. 45) states that samādhi may be very near of attainment by devotion to God. It is remarkable that the Bṛhadyogiyāj. (published by the Kaivalyadhāma of Lonavla) appears to reproduce Y. S. I 24, 28-29 as Śruti in the following verses 'क्लेशकर्मविपाकैश्च वासनाभिस्तथैव च । अपरामृष्टमेवाह पुरुषं हीश्वरं श्रुतिः । वाच्यो यज्ञेश्वरः (वाच्यः स ईश्वरः?) प्रोक्तो वाचकः प्रणवः स्मृतः । वाचकेन तु विज्ञातो वाच्य एव प्रसीदति ॥ तदर्थं प्रणवं जप्यं ध्यातव्यं सततं बुधैः । ईश्वरः पुरुषाख्यस्तु तेनोपास्तः प्रसीदति ॥ बृहद्योगि. II. 43-45. On यो. सू. I. 28 the Bhāṣya explains 'तदस्य योगिनः प्रणवं जपतः प्रणवार्थं च भावयतश्चित्तमेकाग्रं सम्पद्यते ।' and वाच० explains

(*Continued on next page*)

devotion to Īśvara (Īśvara-praṇidhāna) who is a special *puruṣa*, who is untouched by hindrances, by *karma* (good or evil) or by the results of actions or by hankerings, in whom the omniscience, that is only a germ (in others), is infinite; He, being not limited by time, is the teacher of even the ancient teachers. The mystic syllable (Om) is expressive of (i. e. representative or symbol of) God and *japa* of that syllable and constant reflection upon the meaning of 'om' (i. e. on Īśvara) leads to one-pointedness (ekāgratā) of mind. Devotion to Īśvara secures for the practitioner attainment of right knowledge of the nature of the soul and the absence of hindrances (*antarāya*) that distract the mind (I. 29). These hindrances are nine such as illness, langour, doubt &c. and they are also called *Yogamala* (taints or blemishes of Yoga), the enemies (*pratipakṣa*) of Yoga. These hindrances are accompanied by pain, mental distress, tremor of the limbs, irregular inhalation and exhalation (I. 31). These distractions and their accompaniments that are the foes of *samādhi* may be prevented or mastered in various ways such as practice of concentration on one entity (Īśvara or the like), by the practice of such attitudes of mind as friendliness, compassion, cheerfulness and indifference respectively towards the happy or the distressed, the good and the evil (I. 33) or by the expulsion and retention of breath (bhāṣya uses the word 'prāṇāyāma'). When the mind is concentrated then arise the four kinds of samprajñātasamādhi (called *savitarka* &c. in I. 17). The knowledge that is gained in the last kind of samprajñātasamādhi is of a higher order than what is obtained from scripture or inference and the subliminal impression made in this samādhi is hostile to all other impressions and when this last impression also is suppressed or removed, then results the seedless samādhi (i. e. asamprajñātasamādhi). In this last the mind itself ceases (from its task) and the yogin's soul abides in itself, shines forth in its

---

(Continued from last page)

भावनं as 'पुनः पुनश्चित्ते निवेशनम्.' For the eulogy of 'Om' vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 301–302 and for japa (inaudibly done or mental) Manu II. 85–87, Viṣṇu Dh. S. 55. 19, Vasiṣṭha 26. 9 and p. 686 of H. of Dh. II. The Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad, which, Śaṅkarācārya declares, contains the essence of the thought of Vedānta' (Vedāntārthasārasaṅgrahabhūta), has a disquisition on 'om'. Om was in the Upaniṣads (and before them) a symbol of the whole Universe, of the supra-sensible *brahma* and was of metaphysical use. Yoga took it over from the Upaniṣads and made it an instrument of psychology and of dhyāna.' Compare Muṇḍaka Up. II. 2. 4 'प्रणवो धनुः शरो ह्यात्मा ब्रह्म तल्लक्ष्यमुच्यते। अप्रमत्तेन वेद्धव्यं शरवत्तन्मयो भवेत्॥'

own light and is called pure, isolated and liberated.[2320] Īśvara-praṇidhāna does not lead to union with Īśvara, but it enables the soul that is still bound to become what Īśvara always is. In the Yogasūtra there is very little about *bhakti* for God.

Pāda II. The first pāda ends on the note of samādhi and liberation i. e. describes the Yoga for him who has succeeded in concentration. The 2nd pāda deals with the procedure for a person whose mind is not used to concentration but is restless, infatuated or distracted (vyutthita)[2321] and who is desirous of learning the technique. This pāda is the most important of all the four pādas for modern students, either Indian or Western, and has exerted great influence on Dharmaśāstra works. The fundamental idea of Yoga is that the individual self is real, eternal and pure, but it is immersed in the objective world and, though eternal, pursues transient objects. Patañjali is a master psychologist. The goal being set (viz how to secure the isolation of the soul from *avidyā* and the *guṇas* and its attainment of its own pure nature) Y. S. prescribes a rigorous discipline for the attainment of the goal. Patañjali differs from many modern Western psychologists (like Freud)[2322] in two very fundamental matters. The first is that Patañjali puts all emphasis at his command on the freedom and liberation of the soul from bondage, prescribes restraint of the activities of the mind as the

---

2320. तस्मिन् (चित्ते) निवृत्ते पुरुषः स्वरूपमात्रप्रतिष्ठोऽतः शुद्धः केवलो मुक्त इत्युच्यते। भाष्य on यो. सू. I. 51 (तस्यापि निरोधे सर्वनिरोधान्निर्बीजः समाधिः).

2321. व्युत्थान is explained by भोजदेव as 'व्युत्थानं क्षिप्तमूढविक्षिप्ताख्यं भूमित्रयम्' on यो. सू. III. 9 and on III. 37 (ते समाधावुपसर्गा व्युत्थाने सिद्धयः) as व्यवहारदशा.

2322. Freud gives the name 'libido' to the energy of the sexual instinct, while Jung, who was once a disciple of Freud, diverged from Freud, holds it as applicable to all forms of mental, psycho-physical or conative energy. The theory of the Oedipus complex is the central core of the Freudian system. It appears that Freud later in life modified his theory of the Oedipus complex and, though he assumed that the Oedipus complex is present in every infant, he came to hold that in the course of normal development the complex becomes eradicated in early childhood. Vide 'An outline of abnormal psychology' by W. Macdougall (London, ed. of 1952) p. 418.

Prof. J. B. Watson propounded the theory of 'Behaviourism' (vide the work so called, London, 1925), which denies the existence of mind or mental traits, dispositions or tendencies. On this view the subject matter of psychology is not mind but the behaviour or activities of the human being and the concept of instincts on which most psychologists dwell at length becomes meaningless.

means and several preliminary steps of the training of ordinary emotions and will, while several modern psychologists condemn repression of the mind. In the 2nd place Patañjali is a firm believer in the doctrine of *karma* and *rebirth* and (in II. 12–15) holds that even good actions that give rise to a future life of pleasure and happiness are a misery to the enlightened, while modern psychologists speak of several innate instincts and are not at all agreed on what these are, they do not tackle the problem of karma and rebirth and their relation to what they call instincts. If there is no pre-existince of the soul as Christians and many others believe, how do the human *instincts* arise? There is hardly any convincing or satisfactory explanation of this.

The first sūtra (of pāda II) says that the activities or practices that are preliminaries to the attainment of Yoga are *tapas*[2323] (austerity), *svādhyāya* and devotion to Īśvara; these,

---

2323. तपःस्वाध्यायेश्वरप्रणिधानानि क्रियायोगः । समाधिभावनार्थः क्लेशतनूकरणार्थश्च । अविद्यास्मितारागद्वेषाभिनिवेशाः क्लेशाः । यो. सू. II. 1–3. Various definitions of *tapas* occur in the Dharmaśāstra and other works. The word *tapas* occurs in the Ṛgveda over a dozen times. Vide Ṛg. VI. 5. 4, VIII. 59. 6, VIII. 60. 16, X. 16. 4, X. 87. 14 in all of which it is possible to take tapas in the sense of heat. But in Ṛg. X. 109. 4, X. 154. 2, 4 (pitṛntapasvataḥ), 5 (ṛṣīn tapasvataḥ), X. 183. 1, X. 190. 1 tapas means 'austerities, asceticism or bodily mortification.' तपसा येऽनाधृष्यास्तपसा ये स्वर्ययुः । तपो ये चक्रिरे महस्तांश्चिदेवापि गच्छतात् ॥ ऋ. X. 154. 2 (this is addressed to the soul of the deceased person) 'join them that are unassailable owing to tapas, that went to heaven by tapas and that performed great tapas'. The emphasis on asceticism (or tapas) appeared among Indians earlier than among any other known people. In Ṛg. X. 190. 1 it is stated that right and truth and the sun and the moon and the universe are born of tapas. In Ṛg X. 109. 4 the seven sages are said to have sat down for tapas. In Ṛg. X. 136. 2 sages (*munis*) having long hair and wearing dirty yellowish clothes are said to roam over paths. In the Śat. Br. VI. 1. 1. 13 and Ait. Br. XI. 6. 4 it is indicated that *tapas* like *Yajña* would give everything. The Upaniṣads (e. g. Tai. Up. III. 5 'tapasā brahma vijijñāsasva', Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 22) emphasize that tapas is one of the means of realizing brahma. Chān. Up. II. 23 postulates tapas as the 2nd of three *dharmaskandhas*. The Āp. Dh. S. I. 2. 5. 1 holds that the strict observances laid down for a Vedic student are called tapas (नियमेषु तपःशब्दः); Gautama Dh. S. 19. 15 provides that sexual purity, truthfulness, bathing three times in the day, wearing a wet garment, sleeping on the sacrificial ground and fast are austerities. Manu X. 70 provides that even three prāṇāyāmas are the highest tapas for all brāhmaṇas provided they are performed according to prescribed rules and are accompanied by the seven *vyāhṛtis* and *praṇava*. Manu (XI. 234–244) contains a grand eulogy of tapas; verse 238 states 'everything can be

(*Continued on next page*)

when resorted to, serve for the cultivation of samādhi and for minimising the *kleśas*, which are avidyā (nescience which is the field that produces the other four), *asmitā* (the feeling of personality), *rāga* (attachment to pleasures), *dveṣa* (aversion, that dwells angrily on pain and its causes) and *abhiniveśa* (will to live or clinging to life). Tapas is explained by Vyāsabhāṣya (on Y. S. II. 32) as bearing or enduring the pairs (of opposites) such as hunger and thirst, cold and heat, standing and sitting, stillness of a stump (i. e. not indicating what is passing in one's mind even by gestures), stillness of the body (not speaking at all), and also such observances as Kṛcchra, Cāndrāyaṇa and Sāntapana (vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 120 and 132, 134–137, 151 respectively for kṛcchra &c.).

The Vyāsabhāṣya explains 'svādhyāya' as the *japa* (inaudible repetition) of *om* and other holy texts or study of the śāstras treating of liberation.[2324] The Śat. Br. XI. 5. 7 contains a eulogy of svādhyāya and the words 'svādhāyo'dhyetavyaḥ' (one should study the Veda) occur frequently therein. *Om* is the most prominent among the symbols (*pratīkas*) under which the upāsanā of the supra-sensible brahma was to be carried out. Vide Chān. Up. I. 1. 1 (om–ityetad–akṣaram–udgītham–upāsīta), Tai. Up. I. 8 (om-iti brahma, om-itidam sarvam), Muṇḍaka Up. II. 2. 4 (praṇavo dhanuḥ śaro hyātmā brahma tal–lakṣyam–ucyate, 'om is the bow, the soul is the arrow, brahma is the

(*Continued from last page*)

accomplished by tapas, since tapas has invincible power'. Yāj. also (I. 198–202) emphasizes the great importance of tapas. Jaimini (in PMS III. 8. 9) employs the word tapas for 'fast'. Frequent eulogies of tapas are found in the Mahābhārata as in Vanaparva 259. 13. 17, Śānti, chap. 5 and 12 'Gods and sages secured their position by tapas', Ānuśāsana 122. 5–11). Śāntiparva 79. 18 explains अहिंसा सत्यवचनमानृशंस्यं दमो घृणा। एतत्तपो विदुर्धीरा न शरीरस्य शोषणम्॥. All passages of the Mahābhārata are taken from Chitraśālā Press edition in this note. Yogins are said to repeat the Ajapā japa i. e. while they breathe inwards there is सोऽहं and when they breathe out there is हंसः and the combined words सोऽहं हंसः mean 'I am that *haṁsa*' (the eternal Spirit)'. Compare बृहद्योगियाज्ञ. II. 115. 'हंसं तुर्यं परं ब्रह्म'.

2324. स्वाध्यायः प्रणवादिपवित्राणां जपो मोक्षशास्त्राध्ययनं वा। व्यासभाष्य on यो. सू. II. 1. गौ. ध. सू. 19. 12 (= बौ. ध. सू. III. 10. 10, वसिष्ठ 22. 9) enumerates the Upaniṣads, Vedānta and some vedic texts as holy texts by repeating which a man expiates sins. वसिष्ठधर्मसूत्र 28. 10–15 (= विष्णुधर्मसूत्र 56 in prose = शङ्खस्मृति chap. 10 12 and chap. 11) enumerate holy texts (pavitrāṇi) from all Vedas. The word 'praṇava' occurs in the Tai. S. III. 2. 9. 5–6 'उद्गीथ एवोद्गातॄणामृचः प्रणव उक्थशंसिनाम्, which is quoted by शबर on पू. मी. सू. III. 7. 42.

target &c.), Praśna Up. V. 5 (Yaḥ punar-etam trimātreṇomity-etenaivākṣareṇa param puruṣam-abhidhyāyīta). The Y. S. borrows this importance of Om from the Upaniṣads. The five *kleśas* are defined in Y. S. II. 5-9. Avidyā (ignorance)[2325] consists in regarding the non-eternal as eternal, the impure as pure, pain as pleasure, the non-self as the self. Asmitā (sense of personality) consists in the seer (the self) being held as if identical with the instruments of seeing (such as mind and sense organs). Abhiniveśa (clinging to life) means the craving ('May I not cease to live, may I live') which sweeps on by its own force and is established in this form even among the learned. Īśvarapraṇidhāna has been explained above (p. 1412 note 2319). The Y. S. (II. 11 and 12) says that the kleśas have subtile conditions (viz. avidyā and asmitā) and coarse effects in the form of vṛttis (the fluctuations of the mind, rāga, dveṣa and abhiniveśa); escape from the former is secured by resolving them by means of real knowledge while the coarse ones are controlled by contemplation (dhyāna). The accumulated deposits of *Karma* arise from the five *kleśas*, are fit to be experienced in the seen birth (that is in the present birth) and in an unseen (i. e. future) birth. So long as the root (viz. the kleśas) exists the accumulated karma leads to fruition in three forms viz. birth, life (long or short) and experience, which three result in giving joy or

---

2325. अनित्याशुचिदुःखानात्मसु नित्यशुचिसुखात्मख्यातिरविद्या । दृग्दर्शनशक्त्योरेकात्मतेवास्मिता । सुखानुशयी रागः । दुःखानुशयी द्वेषः । स्वरसवाही विदुषोऽपि तथा रूढोऽभिनिवेशः । यो. सू. II. 5-9 ; the भाष्य explains the last 'सर्वस्य प्राणिन इयमात्माशीर्नित्या भवति मा न भूवं भूयासमिति । न चाननुभूतमरणधर्मकस्यैषा भवत्यात्माशीः । ... ... स चायमभिनिवेशः क्लेशः ... कृमेरपि जातमात्रस्य ... मरणत्रास उच्छेददृष्ट्यात्मकः पूर्वजन्मानुभूतमरणदुःखमनुमापयति ।.' With the यो. सू. II. 5 compare ब्रह्माण्डपुराण 'अनित्ये नित्यसंज्ञा च दुःखे च सुखदर्शनम् । अस्वे स्वमिति च ज्ञानमशुचौ शुचिनिश्चयः ॥ रागद्वेषविद्धिश्च तदज्ञानमुदाहृतम् । IV. 3. 39-40 q. by कृत्यकल्प० (on मोक्ष p. 124). In Venk. ed. the last half is different. Compare also विष्णुपुराण IV. 7. 11 अनात्मन्यात्मबुद्धिर्या &c. क्लेशमूलः कर्माशयो दृष्टादृष्टजन्मवेदनीयः । सति मूले तद्विपाको जात्यायुर्भोगाः । ते ह्लादपरितापफलाः पुण्यापुण्यहेतुत्वात् । परिणाम-ताप-संस्कार-दुःखैर्गुणवृत्तिविरोधाच्च दुःखमेव सर्वं विवेकिनः । यो. सू. II. 12-15. वाचस्पति explains आशय as 'आशेरते सांसारिकाः पुरुषाः अस्मिन्नित्याशयः । कर्मणामाशयो धर्माधर्मौ '. On योगसूत्र II. 13 the भाष्य puts forward four possible alternatives about karma and punarjanma, rejects the first three and accepts the 4th. It may be quoted here 'तत्रेदं विचार्यते किमेकं कर्मैकस्य जन्मनः कारणम्, अथैकं कर्मानेकं जन्म आक्षिपति-इति । द्वितीया विचारणा-किमनेकं कर्मानेकं जन्म निर्वर्तयति, अथानेकं कर्मैकं जन्म निर्वर्तयति इति. On II. 14 ते ... हेतुत्वात् one may note the following Upaniṣad passages on which the sūtra is based, viz. बृ. उप. III. 2. 13, छा. उप. V. 10. 7. The last two passages illustrate the meaning of जाति in यो. सू. II. 13. The above passages will have to be quoted later under karma and punarjanma.

anguish according as the accumulation is due to meritorious or evil acts. The Yogasūtra says that the Yoga system has, just like the system of medicine,[2325a] four divisions or aspects, viz. *saṁsāra* (the round of births or transmigration), the cause of saṁsāra, the release from saṁsāra, the means of release (viz. samyak-darśana, insight into reality or discriminating discernment between the puruṣa and sattva, unassailed by false knowledge); sūtras 16–27 of the 2nd pāda set out these four and explain some of the terms used in defining them. Sūtra 28 provides that when impurities are washed away by practising the aṅgas of Yoga, the knowledge shines forth (more and more) till discriminatory discernment becomes perfect. Then sūtra[2326] 29 enumerates the eight *aṅgas* (aids, or auxiliaries) of Yoga, viz. *yama* (abstinences), *niyama* (observances), āsana (bodily posture), prāṇāyāma (control or regulation of breath), pratyāhāra (withdrawal or suppression of the organs of sense), dhāraṇā (fixed attention), dhyāna (meditation or contemplation), samādhi (concentration or absorption into the object of meditation). The Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra enumerates the same eight

---

2325a. यथा चिकित्साशास्त्रं चतुर्व्यूहम् ... एवमिदमपि शास्त्रं चतुर्व्यूहमेव ... तद्यथा। योगभाष्य on II. 15; vide p. 939 note 1510a for the whole passage. हेयं दुःखमनागतम्। द्रष्टृदृश्ययोः संयोगो हेयहेतुः। ... तस्य हेतुरविद्या। तदभावात्संयोगाभावो हानं तद् दृशेः कैवल्यम्। विवेकख्यातिरविप्लवा हानोपायः। यो. सू. II. 16, 17, 24–26. Compare these four aspects with the four Noble Truths of Buddhism cited in note 1510a above. विप्लव means मिथ्याज्ञान acc. to वाचस्पति.

2326. योगाङ्गानुष्ठानादशुद्धिक्षये ज्ञानदीप्तिराविवेकख्यातेः। यम-नियमासन-प्राणायाम-प्रत्याहार-धारणा-ध्यान-समाधयोऽष्टावङ्गानि॥ यो. सू. II. 28–29. The भाष्य on II. 29 is: 'तेषां (योगाङ्गानां) अनुष्ठानात् पञ्चपर्वणो विपर्ययस्याशुद्धिरूपस्य क्षयो नाशः। ... यथा यथा च साधनान्यनुष्ठीयन्ते तथा तथा तनुत्वमशुद्धिरापद्यते यथा यथा च क्षीयते तथा तथा क्षयक्रमानुरोधिनी ज्ञानस्यापि दीप्तिर्विवर्धते। सा खल्वेषा विवृद्धिः प्रकर्षमनुभवत्याविवेकख्यातेः, आगुणपुरुषस्वरूपविज्ञानादित्यर्थः।.' The five क्लेशs mentioned in यो. सू. II. 3 are called विपर्यय. It is somewhat surprising that the eight aṅgas 'यम...समाधयोऽष्टावङ्गानि' (in prose) are quoted as from महाभारत in the कृत्यकल्प° (मोक्षकाण्ड p. 167) and by अपरार्क p. 1022. The वैखानसस्मार्तसूत्र (B. I. ed.) VIII. 10 divides yogins into three classes owing to the differences in their practices and abstentions, viz. सारङ्ग, एकार्व्य and विसरग; and each of these is again subdivided into further sub-classes. It further states that some of these called Anirodhakāḥ do not practise prāṇāyāma, others called Mārgagāḥ practise only prāṇāyāma and the rest and those called vimārgagāḥ practise all the eight aṅgas, but they regard even God that is proper for contemplation as not so. The original words are 'ये विमार्गगास्तेषां यमनियम ...स्यष्टाङ्गं कल्पयन्तो ध्येयमप्यन्यथा कुर्वन्ति।' It is difficult to say what the last clause exactly means. It is probable that in this sentence reference is made to some class of yogins that do not contemplate on God, but hold that without contemplation on God they can secure liberation (*kaivalya*, *mukti*).

aṅgas of Yoga. The remaining sūtras of *pāda* two (from 30 to 55) deal with the enumeration and definitions of yamas and niyamas, their explanations and the treatment of āsana, prāṇāyāma and pratyāhāra. The Śāntiparva (304.7 = 316.7 of Ch. ed.) speaks of Yoga as 'aṣṭaguṇita' or aṣṭaguṇin). Out of the eight aṅgas the first five are indirectly useful for samādhi, because they eradicate what are opposed to samādhi (such as hiṁsā, asatya &c.), and are therefore called *bahiraṅga* (external, indirect) sādhanas (means) of Yoga, while dhāraṇā, dhyāna and samādhi are said to be *antaraṅga* to Yoga (Y. S. III. 7, 'trayam-antaraṅgam pūrvebhyaḥ'. The last three are dealt with in the 3rd pāda. It is these sūtras in the 2nd *pāda* that are emphasized and elaborated in Dharmaśāstra works. Therefore some detailed treatment of these matters is needed here.

In some works, such as the Gorakṣasaṁhitā the aṅgas of yoga are said to be only six (omitting yama and niyama or omitting some others). The Maitrāyaṇī Up. (VI. 18), the Dhyānabindu Up. the Atri-smṛti XI. 6, Dakṣa VII. 34, Skandapurāṇa, Kāśīkhaṇḍa, 41. 59 and Buddhists say the same. Manu[2327] provides (IV. 204) 'a wise man should always practise *yamas* but not the *niyamas* always; one who only practises niyamas and does not practise yamas incurs sin (or falls into hell)'. This does not mean that niyamas are forbidden but it means only this that yamas are far more important than niyamas. The words 'yama' and 'niyama' both occur in the Śāntiparva (cr. ed. 326. 15 and 339. 16 of Ch. ed.). Some Smṛtis omit them from the aṅgas of yoga probably because they are prescribed for all persons in general by Manu, Yāj. and others. Manu does not enumerate yamas and niyamas, but Yāj. (quoted on p. 1406, n. 2303 above) enumerates ten yamas and ten niyamas. The five yamas[2328] of the Y. S. are

---

2327. तथा तत्प्रयोगकल्पः। प्राणायामः प्रत्याहारो ध्यानं धारणा तर्कः समाधिः षडङ्ग इत्युच्यते योगः। मैत्रा. उप. II. 18; अत्रिस्मृति IX. 6 and दक्षस्मृति VII. 3 mention the same six aṅgas (including *tarka*) as in मैत्रा. उप. 'आसनं प्राणसंरोधः प्रत्याहारश्च धारणा। ध्यानं समाधिरेतानि योगाङ्गानि भवन्ति षट्॥ ध्यानबिन्दु उप.° verse 41 (Adyar ed p. 196), गोरक्षशतक I. 4, and स्कन्दपु. (काशीखण्ड 41. 59); अपरार्क on या. III. 110 p. 990) quotes a smṛti text enumerating six aṅgas of yoga (omitting यम, नियम, आसन and adding तर्क). The बृहद्योगियाज्ञ. IX. 35 and लिङ्ग-पुराण (I. 8. 8-9) mentions eight aṅgas. अपरार्क (p. 990) explains 'ततो मनोबुद्धिपरित्यागेनात्मनि विमर्शस्तर्कः'. वायुपुराण XI. 76 mentions only five, प्राणायाम, ध्यान, प्रत्याहार, धारणा and स्मरण in that order.

2328. अहिंसा-सत्यास्तेय-ब्रह्मचर्यापरिग्रहा यमाः। जातिदेशकालसमयानवच्छिन्नाः सार्वभौमा महाव्रतम्। यो. सू. II. 30-31; some words of the भाष्य may be quoted;

(*Continued on next page*)

ahimsā (non-injury to all creatures and at all times), *satya* (truthfulness), *asteya* (non-stealing i. e. not appropriating others' things in a way not sanctioned by the Śāstra), *brahmacarya* (i. e. control of the organ of generation while guarding the other organs of sense also), *aparigraha* (non-acceptance of anything from another beyond what is necessary for preserving the body). These five constitute for a yogin a great vrata when practised without reference to species, place, time and occasions (or exigencies). As provided by Manu, yamas have to be observed by all but there are exceptions. The observance of yamas would be called vrata, but the rigorous observance of yamas without allowing exceptions is called by the Y. S. *mahāvrata* which has to be observed by yogins without exception at all stages. The observance of yamas and niyamas is a first step for the soul's ultimate success in winning Liberation or Isolation (kaivalya), since, unless the soul is purged of all sexual and egoistic desires, it cannot live the divine or spiritual life that the higher stages of yoga require. What is meant may be briefly exemplified as follows: Smṛtis recognize some exceptions to all these in the case of ordinary people. For example, it is the kṣatriya's duty to fight and therefore it was provided by Manu (VII. 87, 89) that a kṣatriya should not run away from battle and that kṣatriyas fighting and dying in battle on both sides went to heaven. Vide Yāj. I. 324. So *hiṁsā* was allowed to a kṣatriya but if he wanted to follow the Yoga discipline he had to give up hiṁsā. Similarly, Smṛtis excused untruth on five occasions (vide Gautama 23. 29, Vasiṣṭha 16. 36, Ādiparva 82. 16, Śāntiparva 34. 25 and 165. 30, quoted in H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 353 and notes 536, 537). Manu in IV. 138 makes an exception for ordinary men viz. one should not speak what though true is painful to another (na brūyāt satyamapriyam). But one who enters on the discipline of Yoga must always speak the truth except when speaking the truth would result in the ruin of

---

(*Continued from last page*)

तत्राहिंसा सर्वथा सर्वदा सर्वभूतानामनभिद्रोहः। उत्तरे च यमनियमास्तन्मूलास्तत्सिद्धिपरतयैव तत्प्रतिपादनाय प्रतिपाद्यन्ते। ... ब्रह्मचर्यं गुप्तेन्द्रियस्योपस्थस्य संयमः। विषयाणामर्जन-रक्षण-क्षयसङ्गहिंसादोषदर्शनादस्वीकरणमपरिग्रहः।. सिद्धि in the भाष्य above means ज्ञान and not उत्पत्ति; on गुप्तेन्द्रियस्य, वाचस्पति explains 'संयतोपस्थोऽपि स्त्री-प्रेक्षण-तदालाप-कन्दर्पायतन-तदङ्गस्पर्शनसक्तो न ब्रह्मचर्यवानिति तन्निरासायोक्तं गुप्तेन्द्रियस्येति।. The भोजवृत्ति and योगसुधाकर respectively explain अपरिग्रह as 'अपरिग्रहो भोगसाधनानामनङ्गीकारः' and 'अपरिग्रहः शरीरस्थितिमात्रव्यतिरिक्तभोगसाधनास्वीकारः'. देवल quoted by गृहस्थकाण्ड of कल्पतरु states that himsā is of ten kinds (p. 304). The लिङ्गपु. I. 8. 10-28 names these five यमs and defines them.

creatures.[2329] The Mitākṣarā on Yāj. III. 312 remarks that telling a falsehood in the case of arranging a marriage though excused (by smṛtis) should be avoided and also the beating of a son or a pupil as punishment by one who observes a *vrata*. A householder who approaches his wife on certain specified days after her monthly illness and avoids the parvan days (vide H. of Dh. vol. III. n 1425) is to be regarded as one observing brahmacarya, acc. to Yāj. *I. 79 and Manu IV. 128, but if* he takes to the path of Yoga, he would have to give up this latitude (vide note 2308,[2330] above) and avoid all contact whatever with all women including his own wife as the Liṅgapurāṇa emphasizes. The Yuktidīpikā, one of the earliest commentaries on the Sāṅkhyakārikā, mentions (on p. 112) five yamas but puts 'akalkatā' (absence of crookedness) as the 5th instead of *aparigraha.* The Viṣṇupurāṇa (VI. 7. 36-37) enumerates five yamas and five niyamas as in Y. S. but substitutes 'mind bent on the highest brahma' (kurvīta brahmaṇi tathā parasmin pravaṇam manaḥ) for 'Īśvarapraṇidhāna'. The five niyamas according to Y. S. II. 32 [2331] are *śauca* (cleanliness), *santoṣa* (contentment), *tapas* (austerity), *svādhyāya* (study of Veda), *īśvarapraṇidhāna* (devotion to God, or surrendering all actions to him). Three of the five niyamas, viz. tapas, svādhyāya and Īśvarapraṇidhāna constitute *kriyāyoga* as already stated in Y. S. II. 1. It is most difficult to give an objective definition of duty, but duties can be defined on the subjective side. The object of emphasizing duties is to make men rise above lower desires and to make the higher self shine forth. These are

---

2329. यदि चैवमप्यभिधीयमाना (वाक्) भूतोपघातपरैव स्यात् न सत्यं भवेत्पापमेव भवेत्तेन पुण्याभासेन पुण्यप्रतिरूपकेण कष्टं तमः प्राप्नुयात्। तस्मात्परीक्ष्य सर्वभूतहितं सत्यं ब्रूयात्। भाष्य on यो. सू. II. 30; यथा विवाहादिष्वभ्यनुज्ञातस्याप्यनृतवचनस्य निवृत्त्यर्थं सत्यत्वविधानम्। पुत्रशिष्यादिकमपि न ताडनीयमेवमर्थमहिंसादिविधानमित्येवमादि। मिता. on या. III. 312-13. देवल (in कल्पतरु गृहस्थकाण्ड) states 'अनृतं द्विविधं, असत्यं विसंवादश्च। प्रागभ्युपगतानामसंकीर्तनं विसंवाद इति।' p. 309.'

2330. कर्मणा मनसा वाचा सर्वावस्थासु सर्वदा। सर्वत्र मैथुनत्यागं ब्रह्मचर्यं प्रचक्षते॥ कूर्म II. 11. 18, यो. या. I. 55; अङ्गारसदृशी नारी घृतकुम्भसमः पुमान्। तस्मान्नारीषु संसर्गं दूरतः परिवर्जयेत्। लिङ्गपु. I. 8. 23.

2331. शौच-सन्तोष-तपः-स्वाध्यायेश्वरप्रणिधानानि नियमाः। यो. सू. II. 32; भाष्य 'तत्र शौचमृज्जलादिजनितं मेध्याभ्यवहरणादि बाह्यं, आभ्यन्तरं चित्तमलानामाक्षालनम्'; for तपः acc. to यो. सू. vide n. 2323 above. Vide कूर्मपु. II. 11. 20-29 for these five and their definitions. The युक्तिदीपिका (p. 112) enumerates the नियमs as अक्रोधो गुरुशुश्रूषा शौचमाहारलाघवमप्रमादः इति पञ्च नियमाः. The same five are quoted as Vyāsa's in a verse by कृत्यक० (गृहस्थकाण्ड p. 302). वाचस्पति explains 'चित्तमला मदमानासूयादयस्तदपनयो मनःशौचम्'.

based more or less on the Upanisads; vide e. g. Chān. Up. III. 17. 4 where *tapas*, *ahiṁsā*, *truthfulness*, *dāna*, (charity) and *ārjava* (straightforwardness) are put forward as virtues to be cultivated by a sacrificer, Br. Up. V. 2.3. where all men are asked to cultivate *dama* (self-restraint), *dāna* (charity), *dayā* (kindness). Therefore, the yamas prescribed by the Yogasūtra constitute what may be called extra-regarding duties and are mostly in the nature of prohibitions (such as 'don't injure anyone, don't tell a lie, don't rob a person, don't accept gifts'), while the niyamas are concerned with the individual himself (who has embarked on Yoga practice) and are of a positive character (viz. be clean, be contented, be austere, do study the Veda and be a devotee of Īśvara). The Amarakośa[2332] defines 'yama' as actions that are obligatory (or to be always performed) and that depend upon the body as the means for being carried out, while niyamas are acts that are not obligatory (or not to be continuously engaged in) and that depend (for carrying them out) on means that are outside the body (such as water &c). Śauca (cleanliness) is of two kinds, *bāhya* (of the body effected with water, loose earth, pañcagavya, pure food &c.) and *ābhyantara* (internal or mental). Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 651-52 and vol. IV. pp. 310-311 for details of the śauca of both kinds. A verse of Manu (V. 106) deserves to be noted[2333] in this connection viz. 'of all kinds of śauca the highest is the one that relates to wealth (one must desire wealth without depriving another of his wealth by improper means); that man is *śuci* (pure) who is pure as to wealth and not he who is purified by loose earth and water.' Sūtras 33-34 of pāda II provide that when the practitioner of Yoga is assailed by the outbreak of the fever of perverse thoughts (such as 'I shall kill him who has harmed me', 'I shall tell a lie, I shall appropriate another's wealth, I shall commit adultery with another's wife'), he should revolve in his mind and cultivate the opposites of such thoughts and dwell on the consequences of such thoughts, viz. they cause endless suffering and lack of right knowledge. Yama and

2332. शरीरसाधनापेक्षं नित्यं यत्कर्म तद्यमः । नियमस्तु स यत्कर्मानित्यमागन्तुसाधनम्॥ अमरकोश (2nd काण्ड, ब्रह्मवर्ग). क्षीरस्वामी quotes the yogasūtra definitions and explains 'आगन्तु बाह्यं मृज्जलादि साधनं यत्रेति, अत एव कृत्रिमकर्म नियमः।'.

2333. सर्वेषामेव शौचानामर्थशौचं परं स्मृतम्। योऽर्थे शुचिर्हि स शुचिर्न मृद्वारिशुचिः शुचिः॥ मनुस्मृति V. 106; विष्णुधर्मसूत्र 22.89 has the same verse, but reads अन्न for अर्थ in both places. The विष्णुधर्मोत्तर III. 275. 13 states: तस्माद्धि सर्वशौचानां मनःशौचं परं स्मृतम्।. Compare आहारशुद्धौ सत्त्वशुद्धिः in छा. उप. VII. 26. 2 and आहार ... शुद्धिरित्याचार्याः as quoted from हारीतधर्मसूत्र by अपरार्क on या. I. 154.

niyama constitute the preliminary ethical code which an aspirant for yoga must observe and some part of it must be followed by all men as Manu and Yāj. prescribe.

In sūtras 35 to 45 (of pāda II.) the results of the continuous practice of the several yamas and niyamas are set out viz. when the aspirant has become established in ahiṁsā, all beings (men and animals) give up enmity[2334] in his presence. When the aspirant for Yoga is well grounded in the practice of abstinence from falsehood his speech comes out to be effective unfailingly (that is, if he says to a person 'be you a righteous man' or 'may you attain heaven', the man becomes righteous or attains *svarga*). When he becomes rooted in abstinence from theft all jewels wait upon him from all quarters (that is, though he may not hanker after riches or means, the latter come to him of their own accord). When the Yogin is firmly fixed in brahmacarya,[2335] he secures energy (whereby he treads the path to such super-normal powers as aṇimā) and when he reaches perfection he is able to transfer knowledge about Yoga and its aṅgas to his disciples. In Y. S. I. 20 it is stated that *asamprajñāta-samādhi* follows when the yogin has faith, *vīrya* (energy) and other qualities. The greatest emphasis is laid on chastity in thought, word and deed for the yogin or the seeker for *brahma* (vide Muṇḍaka III. 1. 5, 'satyena labhyas-tapasā hyeṣa ātmā samyag-jñānena brahmacaryeṇa nityam'). The idea is that the yogin makes very rapid progress towards the final goal of *samādhi* and *kaivalya* if he is thoroughly chaste and that without it the practice of rājayoga is futile and dangerous. Those interested in the importance of 'brahmacarya' should read Mahātmā Gandhi's 'self-restraint versus self-indulgence' (3rd ed. 1928), particularly the Appendix I. pp. 137–158 which reproduce W. L. Hare's article). When the yogin is firmly established in non-

2334. अहिंसाप्रतिष्ठायां तत्संनिधौ वैरत्यागः। यो. सू. II. 35; वाचस्पति remarks 'शाश्वतिकविरोधा अप्यश्व-महिष-मूषक-मार्जाराहिनकुलादयोऽपि भगवतः प्रतिष्ठितहिंसस्य संनिधानात्तच्चित्तानुकारिणो वैरं त्यजन्ति.' Sanskrit poets love to dwell on this aspect of the hermitages of sages e. g. vide कादम्बरी, पूर्वभाग p. 45 (of Peterson's ed., description of Jābāli's hermitage') 'अस्य भगवतः प्रसादादेवोपशान्तवैरमपगत-मत्सरं तपोवनम्। अहो प्रभावो महात्मनाम्। अत्र हि शाश्वतिकमपहाय विरोधमुपशान्तात्मा-नस्तिर्यञ्चोऽपि तपोवनसुखमनुभवन्ति। तथाहि एष ... ... विशति शिखिनः कलापमातपाहतो निःशङ्कमहिः। अयमुत्सृज्य मातरं ... प्रक्षरत्क्षीरधारमापिबति कुरङ्गशावकः सिंहीस्तनम्।'.

2335. Vide छा. उप. VIII. 2. 10 यं यमन्तमभिकामो भवति यं कामं कामयते सोऽस्य सङ्कल्पादेव समुत्तिष्ठति तेन सम्पन्नो महीयते।; ब्रह्मचर्यप्रतिष्ठायां वीर्यलाभः। यो. सू. II. 38; I. 20 is 'श्रद्धावीर्यस्मृतिसमाधिप्रज्ञापूर्वक इतरेषाम्'. अपरिग्रहस्थैर्ये जन्मकथंतासम्बोधः। यो. सू. II. 39, कथंता means किंप्रकारता.

acceptance of gifts he has a desire to know his past, present and future lives (and receives illumination thereon).

As a result of having to clean[2336] one's body the Yogin becomes disgusted with his own body and avoids contact with the bodies of others. Other results of cleanliness (of the mind) that arise are the purity of *sattvaguṇa* (i. e. not being assailed by *rajas* and *tamas*), gentleness, one-pointedness (of the mind), mastery over the senses and fitness for the sight (realization) of the Self. From contentment results[2337] supreme happiness. *Tapas* gives rise[2338] to perfection in the body (i. e. acquisition of some occult powers like aṇimā) and perfection as to the sense organs (such as being able to hear and to see what is distant) owing to the eradication of impurities (i. e. the *kleśas* and sin); (continuous) study of the Veda (and japa of *om* &c.) leads on to the union with (realization of) the deity he chooses. From devotion to Īśvara results perfection in Samādhi.

Āsana (bodily posture)[2339] is defined in Y. S. as one that is stable and easy (or comfortable). Āsana means a seat which is covered with *kuśa* grass, deer-skin and a garment in that order (this would be *bāhya āsana*) as laid down in Gītā (VI. 11),

2336. शौचात् स्वाङ्गजुगुप्सा परैरसंसर्गः । सत्त्वशुद्धिसौमनस्यैकाग्र्येन्द्रियजयात्मदर्शनयोग्यता च । यो. सू. II. 40–41. The first sūtra refers to बाह्यशौच and the 2nd to आभ्यन्तरशौच. मनु II. 98 defines जितेन्द्रिय as 'श्रुत्वा स्पृष्ट्वा च दृष्ट्वा च भुक्त्वा घ्रात्वा च यो नरः । न हृष्यति ग्लायति वा स विज्ञेयो जितेन्द्रियः ॥'; vide कुल्लूक for illustrations.

2337. सन्तोषादनुत्तमः सुखलाभः । यो. सू. II. 42. The भाष्य on this only quotes a Śāntiparva verse (vide p. 1399 n. 2295 above). वाचस्पति explains न विद्यते अस्मादुत्तमः इत्यनुत्तमः.

2338. कायेन्द्रियसिद्धिरशुद्धिक्षयात् तपसः । स्वाध्यायादिष्टदेवतासंप्रयोगः । समाधिसिद्धिरीश्वरप्रणिधानात् । यो. सू. II. 43–45. भोज explains सम्प्रयोग as 'सा देवता प्रत्यक्षी भवति' and समाधिसिद्धि as 'स भगवानीश्वरः प्रसन्नः सकलन्तरायरूपान् क्लेशान् परिहृत्य समाधिं सम्बोधयति'. Vide यो. सू. I. 23 for समाधिलाभ from ईश्वरप्रणिधान. The भाष्य on II. 44 explains 'देवा ऋषयः सिद्धाश्च स्वाध्यायशीलस्य दर्शनं गच्छन्ति, कार्ये चास्य वर्तन्ते'.

2339. स्थिरसुखमासनम् । प्रयत्नशैथिल्यानन्तसमापत्तिभ्याम् । ततो द्वन्द्वानभिघातः । यो. सू. II. 46–48. Compare श्वेता. उप. 'त्रिरुन्नतं स्थाप्य समं शरीरं' and 'समे शुचौ शर्करावह्निवालुकाविवर्जिते ॥' (II. 8 and 10). The word अनन्त is explained in different ways. वाच० explains अनन्ते वा नागनायके स्थिरतरफणासहस्रविधृतविश्वम्भरामण्डले समापन्नं चित्तमासनं निर्वर्तयतीति'. This is rather far-fetched and unsatisfactory, as hardly anywhere else is अनन्तनागसमापत्ति recommended. भोज takes अनन्त to mean आकाश 'यदा चाकाशादिगत आनन्त्ये चेतसः समापत्तिः क्रियतेऽव्यवधानेन तादात्म्यमापद्यते तदा देहाहंकाराभावान्नासनं दुःखजनकं भवति ।' This is a little better than Vācaspati's explanation. Brahma is described as सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म (तै. उप. II. 1).

while the word āsana (in Yoga) means bodily posture. It should be noticed that the Yogasūtra does not expressly prescribe any of the numerous āsanas mentioned and defined in the Haṭhayogapradīpikā and other works on Haṭhayoga and indicates that those āsanas are not necessary in the practice of the Pātañjala Yoga and that any posture which is easy, stable and comfortable would be enough for the yogin. The Y. S. here follows the Śv. Up. (II. 8 and 10) and not the works on Haṭhayoga, if any existed in its times. In order to secure the posture described above the yogin should relax the usual physical movements of the body (prayatnaśaithilya) and bring the mind to reflect on the Infinite (*brahma*). As a result of perfect mastery over posture, he is not overwhelmed (or overcome) by the pairs of opposites (such as heat and cold, hunger and thirst).

A few words must be said about āsanas. The present author recommends to all those interested in āsanas a very useful and instructive handbook (in 188 pages) on 'āsanas' composed and published by Sri Kuvalayānanda of the Kaivalyadhāma at Lonavla near Poona (third impression in 1949) with 81 plates (78 on different āsanas and 3 on *nauli*). The Dakṣasmṛti (VII. 5) mentions Padmāsana and Yāj. in III. 198 appears to allude to it. Dr. K. T. Behanan on 'Yoga, a scientific evaluation' inserts 16 figures (between pp. 186–187) of several āsanas. Though the Y. S. does not mention any *āsana* by name yet the Vyāsabhāṣya[2340] names ten and indicates by the word 'ādi'

2340. तद्यथा पद्मासनं वीरासनं भद्रासनं स्वस्तिकं दण्डासनं सोपाश्रयं पर्यङ्कं क्रौञ्चनिषदनं हस्तिनिषदनमुष्ट्रनिषदनं समसंस्थानं स्थिरसुखं यथासुखं चेत्येवमादीनि। भाष्य on योगसूत्र II. 46. About क्रौञ्च° and the following two वाचस्पति says 'क्रौञ्चादीनां निषण्णानां संस्थानदर्शनात् प्रत्येतव्यानि'. सोपाश्रयं 'with the support of a cushion' 'योगपट्टकयोगात् सोपाश्रयम्' (वाचस्पति). In E. I. vol. XXI p. 260, the Kolagallu Ins. of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Khoṭṭiga of Śaka 889 (exact date, 17th February 967 A.D.) mentions 'Daṇḍāsana,' (p. 263) and 'Lohāsanī' p. 264 l. 35. दण्डासनं is explained by वाचस्पति as 'उपविश्य श्लिष्टाङ्गुलिकौ श्लिष्टगुल्फौ भूमिश्लिष्टजङ्घोरुपादौ प्रसार्य दण्डासनमभ्यसेत्'. Yoga had permeated society so much that in several Inscriptions Yogaśāstra and Yoga techniques are mentioned; e. g. in the Tewar Stone Inscription (C. I. I. vol. IV p. 306) of Gayākarṇa in the *Cedi* year 902 (=1151 A. D.), Yogaśāstra (verse 6) and Pātañjalāgama (verse 8) are referred to and in verse 11 the first quarter is प्राणायामसमाधिसिद्धनियमध्यानासनैरन्वहम्. न च पद्मासनाद्योगो न नासाग्रनिरीक्षणात्। दक्षस्मृति VII. 5, explained by विश्वरूप on या. III. 189 (T. S. S.). ऊरुस्थोत्तानचरणः सव्ये न्यस्योत्तरं करम्। उत्तानं किंचिदुन्नाम्य मुखं विष्टभ्य चोरसा॥ याज्ञ. III. 198.

that it knew more. Vīrāsana[2341] is mentioned in Raghuvaṁśa 13. 52. Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. IV. 1. 10 remarks that Padmakāsana and other special āsanas are propounded in Yogaśāstra. The V. S. (IV. 1. 7–10) has in view, acc. to Śaṅkarācārya, the description of āsana in the Gītā (VI. 11), the relaxation of bodily activities and stableness of posture indicated by such words as 'dhyāyatīva pṛthivī' (Chān. Up. VII. 6. 1). According to the H. P. (I. 17) āsana is the first *aṅga* of Haṭhayoga, that Śiva speaks of 84 āsanas, of which four āsanas called Siddha, Padma, Siṁha and Bhadra are the most essential (sārabhūta) and it recommends Siddhāsana as the best (I. 34) and describes it (I. 35). The Haṭhayogapradīpikā names and describes 15 *āsanas* in I. 19-55. The Dhyānabindu Upaniṣad states that there are innumerable āsanas but mentions the same four as the most prominent. Vide figures 16 (p. 55), 18 (p. 57), 62 (p. 97) in Śrī. Kuvalayānanda's work for Siddha, Padma and Siṁha āsanas respectively and figures 105 (p. 186), 106 (p. 187), and 108 (p. 188), for the āsanas called Siddha, Padma and Baddhapadma respectively in Prof. S. S. Goswami's work on Haṭhayoga and p. 28–30 for Siddhāsana, Padmāsana and Baddha-padmāsana respectively in Alain Danielou's work (London, 1949). The Śivasaṁhitā (III. 100) and Gheraṇḍasaṁhitā (II. 1) mention that there are 84 āsanas, while the Gorakṣaśataka[2342] states that there are as many āsanas as there are living species, that all of them are known to Śiva, that out of 84 lakhs of āsanas Śiva chose 84 and that out of these Siddhāsana and Padmāsana are the best and defines these two (I. 5–9).

The word Yoga is applied to many matters in an extended sense (i. e. the method or methods by which union with the

---

2341. वीरासन is explained by वाच० as 'स्थितस्यैकतरः पादो भून्यस्त एकतरश्चाकुञ्चितजानोरुपरि न्यस्त इत्येतद्वीरासनम्।', while मल्लिनाथ (on रघु०) quotes वसिष्ठ's description एकपादमथैकस्मिन्विन्यस्योरुणि संस्थितम्। इतरस्मिंस्तथा चान्यं वीरासनमुदाहृतम्॥. This is almost the same as ह. यो. प्र. I. 21. वाचस्पति explains all the āsanas named by the bhāṣya except the *padmāsana* (which he says is well known). पद्मासन is described in ह. यो. प्र. II. 58 and गोरक्षशतक verse 9. The त्रिशिखिब्राह्मणोपनिषद् (verses 39–40) describes पद्मासन and बद्धपद्मासन and so does Kāśikhaṇḍa 41. 62–63. भद्रासन is defined by वाच० as 'पादतले वृषणसमीपे सम्पुटीकृत्य तस्योपरि पाणिकच्छपिकां कुर्यात्तद्भद्रासनम्' (on यो. सू. II. 46). The योगयाज्ञ० (ed. by Mr. Diwanji) defines it as 'पार्श्वपादौ च पाणिभ्यां दृढं बद्ध्वा सुनिश्चलम्। भद्रासनं भवेदेतत्सर्वव्याधिविषापहम्॥' (III. 12).

2342. आसनानि च तावन्ति यावन्त्यो जीवजातयः। एतेषामतुलान्भेदान् विजानाति महेश्वरः॥ सिद्धं भद्रं तथा सिंहपद्मं चेति चतुष्टयम्। ध्यानबिन्दू० 42 p. 196 (Adyar) The verse आसनानि ... महेश्वरः occurs in गोरक्षशतक 5.

Supreme Self may be promoted) in the Bhagavadgītā, which itself is described as Yogaśāstra and each chapter of which is also called Yoga. For example, we have in the Gītā 'abhyāsayoga' (8. 8, 12. 9), karmayoga (3. 3. and 7), jñānayoga (3. 3.), bhaktiyoga (14. 26). A few other works also do the same. Some Western writers speak of several kinds of Yoga such as Mantrayoga, Jñānayoga, Bhaktiyoga, Karmayoga, Rājayoga and Haṭhayoga (vide 'Bengal Lancer' by F. Yeats-Brown, London, 1930, p. 284), R. C. Oman's 'The Mystics, ascetics and saints of India' p. 172 (ed. of 1905), Geraldine Coster's 'Yoga and Western psychology' p. 10, Alain Danielou's work pp. 83 ff. (for descriptions of Mantrayoga, Layayoga, Kuṇḍalinīyoga &c.). Some late Sanskrit works like the Yogatattvopaniṣad [2343] and Śivasaṁhitā (5. 9) speak of four Yogas viz. Mantrayoga, Haṭhayoga, Layayoga and Rājayoga. All these have in view the system of Patañjali, but each emphasizes some particular aspect of yoga discipline. But there are really only two main systems of Yoga, viz. the one expounded in the Yogasūtra and its bhāṣya by Vyāsa and the other dealt with in such works as the Gorakṣaśataka, the Haṭhayogapradīpikā of Svātmārāma-yogin[2344] with the commentary called Jyotsnā by Brahmānanda. Briefly, the difference between the two is that the Yoga of Patañjali concentrates all effort on the discipline of the mind, while Haṭhayoga mainly concerns itself with the body, its health, its purity and freedom from diseases. This is illustrated by the facts that Patañjali defines *āsana* as any posture that is 'sthirasukha', while works on Haṭhayoga describe many āsanas like Mayūrāsana, Kukkuṭāsana, Siddhāsana, which are deemed to remove

---

2343. योगो हि बहुधा ब्रह्मन् भिद्यते व्यवहारतः। मन्त्रयोगो लयश्चैव हठोसौ राजयोगकः॥ मातृकादियुतं मन्त्रं द्वादशाब्दं तु योजयेत्। क्रमेण लभते ज्ञानमणिमादिगुणान्वितम्॥ अल्पबुद्धिरिमं योगं सेवते साधकाधमः॥ लययोगश्चित्तलयः कोटिशः परिकीर्तितः। गच्छंस्तिष्ठन् स्वपन् भुञ्जन् ध्यायेन्निष्कलमीश्वरम्। स एव लययोगः स्यात् &c.। योगतत्त्वोप॰ verses 19. 21–23.

2344. A translation of this work (which contains 388 verses) into English by Srinivasa Iyengar has been published by the Theosophical Publishing House, Madras (3rd ed. 1949). The proper name of the work appears to be हठप्रदीपिका, as shown by I. 3 'हठप्रदीपिकां धत्ते स्वात्मारामः कृपाकरः', by the colophons at the end of each Upadeśa and the first verse of the commentary of Brahmānanda 'Haṭhapradīpikā Jyotsnā'. Acc. to the com. ह and ठ mean सूर्य and चन्द्र and represent respectively right and left nostril-breath. The Śivasaṁhitā is translated by Rai Bahadur Srischandra Vidyārṇava, Pāṇini Office, 2nd ed. 1923 and Gheraṇḍasaṁhitā was translated by Srischandra Vasu, Bombay, 1896.

diseases (I. 31) and which are said to be 84 (for the names of the 84 āsanas vide pp. 146-149 of Danielou's work) and Haṭhayoga deals with such processes[2345] as Dhauti (washing the stomach), Basti (yogic enema) and Nauli (shaking the abdomen) about which Patañjali is silent. Haṭhayoga, if practised with proper guidance and perseverance, will not only endow a man with a strong, healthy, pure and active body but also may develop inner strength and happiness. The technique of Haṭhayoga claims three kinds of results viz. (1) cure of diseases and disorders of the mind also; (2) attainment of supernatural powers called *siddhis*; (3) leading to Rājayoga and *Kaivalya*. The Haṭhayogapradipikā itself states that Haṭhayoga

---

2345. The six क्रियाs of हठयोग are: धौतिर्बस्तिस्तथा नेतिस्त्राटकं नौलिकं तथा। कपालभातिश्चैतानि षट् कर्माणि प्रचक्षते॥ ह. यो. प्र. II. 22. धौति is described in the Journal योगमीमांसा vol. II. pp. 170-177, बस्ति (yogic enema) in vol. I. pp. 101-104, नौलि in vol. I. pp. 25-26 and vol. IV. pp. 320-24 and कपालभाति in the Handbook on 'Prāṇāyāma' (by Shri Kuvalayānanda), part I. pp. 79-100. There are various methods of Dhauti. The present author, who has been suffering from hyperacidity for over 60 years and from duodenal ulcer for at least 35 years, practised on the advice of an Indian doctor holding an English degree in medicine washing of the stomach by swallowing a large quantity of tepid water and then vomitting it. This was done for several years, generally once a week (or oftener). He can say from personal experience that it washed the stomach and reduced acute pain. But he found or thought that it was no cure and gave up the practice after some years. नेति is cleansing the nose and त्राटक is fixing the eyes without winking on a minute object till the tears fill the eyes (निरीक्षेन्निश्चलदृशा सूक्ष्मलक्ष्यं समाहितः। अश्रुसम्पातपर्यन्तमाचार्यैस्त्राटकं स्मृतम्॥ ह. यो. प्र. II. 31). त्राटक is of various types such as नक्षत्रत्राटक, सूर्यत्राटक, आदर्शत्राटक, भ्रूमध्यत्रा°, नासाग्रदृष्टित्रा°. One with weak eyes must not attempt it except under the guidance of an expert. It is a preliminary to *ekāgratā* (one-pointedness of mind) and *dhyāna*. Those interested in the Haṭhayoga may read 'Haṭhayoga, the report of a personal experience', by Theos Barnard, Columbia University Press, New York, 2nd impression, 1945. This author travelled over the whole of India, settled down at a guru's retreat in the hill near Ranchi, and went to Tibet also at his guru's bidding. The book contains 36 photographs, 28 of which represent various *āsanas*, VII, XXVI-VII of Mahāmudrā, Vajrolimudrā and Pāśinīmūdrā, XXXII and XXXIII represent the first and second stages of Uḍḍiyāna-bandha and Nos. XXXIV-VI represent Naulī-madhyamā, Naulī-vāmā and Naulī-dakṣiṇā. The H. Y. P. (III. 6-7) names ten mudrās. Another recent work is 'The Yoga of Health, Youth and Joy' (a treatise on Haṭha-yoga adapted to the West) by Sir Paul Dukes (Cassell, London 1960). This is a very useful book, contains about seventy excellent photographs and is written with great moderation after long personal practice. The author was engaged for years in lecturing to the army on the usefulness of yoga practices.

is expounded only for leading on to Rājayoga[2346] i. e. Rājayoga is the principal fruit of Haṭhayoga and not siddhis and *Kaivalya* is due to Rājayoga. The Haṭhayogapradīpikā enumerates the names of the same eight aṅgas as Patañjali does, but its *yamas* are ten of which taking a light meal is the principal and *ahiṁsā* is the first among niyamas. Besides the eight angas, it deals specially with Mahāmudrā, Khecarī, Jālandhara, Uḍḍiyāna and Mūlabandha, Vajrolī, Amarolī and Sahajolī (I. 26–27). The Haṭhayogapradīpikā (I. 5–8) mentions that Haṭhayoga started from Ādinātha (i. e. Śiva) and then enumerates 35 great siddhas in all from Matsyendranātha, Gorakṣanātha onwards. The famous exposition of the Bhagavadgītā by Jñānadeva called Jñāneśvarī cites at the end the Guruparamparā as Ādinātha, Matsyendranātha, Gorakṣanātha, Gahinīnātha, Nivṛttinātha, Jñānadeva.

There are other differences between the works on Haṭhayoga and the Pātañjala Yoga. According to the Gorakṣaśataka and H. Y. P. the main aim of āsana and prāṇāyāma is to rouse the Kuṇḍalinī (the vital force in a person slumbering at the base of the spine coiled like a snake) and take it through the several cakras and the Suṣumnānāḍī to *brahmadvāra*, while the Y. S. hardly ever dilates upon chakras and nāḍīs.[2347] Several people after reading some modern works on Kuṇḍalinī are tempted to make efforts to rouse the Kuṇḍalinī. This is a dangerous experiment. Shri Purohit Swami in his 'Aphorisms of Yoga' states

---

2346. केवलं राजयोगाय हठविद्योपदिश्यते । हठ० I. 2, on which the com. ज्योत्स्ना remarks राजविद्या एव मुख्यं फलं न सिद्धयः । राजयोगद्वारा कैवल्यं फलम् । ; after mentioning several siddhas such as मत्स्येन्द्रनाथ, शाबरानन्द, भैरव, गोरक्ष, the हठयोगप्रदीपिका (V. 8) concludes इत्यादयो महासिद्धा हठयोगप्रभावतः ।.

2347. Y. S. mentions Nābhicakra, which means no more than the navel that is circular in shape, and Kūrmanāḍī in III. 29 and III. 31 respectively. Vide Gorakṣaṣataka verses 10–23, 54–67 for the chakras, nāḍis, brahmadvāra &c. and H. Y. P. III for the awakening of Kuṇḍalinī. The Gorakṣaṣataka is set out (transliterated text and translation) in W. G. Briggs' work 'Gorakhnath and the Kanphāṭas' pp. 284–304 and was recently edited and published by Swami Kuvalayanand with translation and notes (1959). Dr. Hazariprasad Dwivedi has written a work called 'Nath Sampradaya' (1950) and Dr. Mohansingh also has a work on 'Gorakhnath and medieval Hindu mysticism'. If we take the Guruparamparā set out in the Jñāneśvarī, Gorakhnath should be taken to have flourished about 1100 A. D. or a little later. Vide 'the life of Gorakṣanāth and the succession of disciples' (in Marathi) by Mr. R. C. Dhere (1959). pp. 224.

that the awakening of the Kuṇḍalinī is a terrifying experience, that on the first day on which the Kuṇḍalinī was awakened, the whole body was as it were on fire and he thought that he was dying and that he drank in three months gallons of milk and clarified butter and ate all the leaves on two *nimba* trees (pp. 57–58 of the translation). The germ of the doctrine of nāḍīs in Tantras is found in a verse occurring in Kaṭhā Up. VI. 16 and Chān. Up. VIII. 6. 6 'there are hundred and one nāḍīs (arteries) of the heart; one of them penetrates the (crown of) head; moving upwards by it, one attains immortality; the others (of the nāḍīs) serve for departing in various directions.' The Praśna Up. (III. 6–7) states that each of 101 nāḍīs has 72 sub-nāḍīs, each of which again has 1000 more. Vide Muṇḍaka Up. II. 2. 6. In Chān. Up. VIII. 6. 1 it is stated that the nāḍīs of the heart consist of a subtle substance, brown, white, blue, yellow or red in colour. This is probably the germ of the statement of a nāḍī being called *piṅgalā*. The Maitrāyaṇī Up. VI. 21 speaks of the nāḍī going upwards as Suṣumnā.

The Viṣṇupurāṇa mentions Bhadrāsana[2348] which passage is quoted by Vācaspati. The Purāṇas, Vāyu (11. 13), Mārkaṇḍeya (36. 28), Kūrma (II. 11. 43), Liṅga (I. 8. 86), Garuḍa (I. 238. 11) mention the same three āsanas, viz. Svastika, Padma and Ardhāsana. The Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa (III. 283. 6) prescribes for *dhyāna* the āsanas called Svastika, Sarvatobhadra, Kamala (Padma) and Paryaṅka. The Bhāgavata III. 28. 8 employs the same words as the Gītā VI. 11 about *āsana* (viz. 'śucau deśe pratiṣṭhāpya).

Āsanas are of two kinds, one type being helpful for prāṇāyāma, meditation and concentration, such as Padma, Siddha and Svastika (figure 20 p. 59 in Śrī Kuvalayānanda's handbook on 'Asanas'). The other kind of āsanas are helpful in eradicating diseases and for physical culture. But most of them require different physical movements and the final form assumed by these postures would make deep meditation difficult, if not impossible (vide Śīrṣāsana figures 24–27 between pp. 62–63 of Śrī Kuvalayānanda's handbook on Āsanas), Sarvāṅgāsana (figures 33–36) of the same work, Hālāsana (fig. 42–47 of the same), Viparītakaraṇī (figures 77–78 pp. 121–123), Mayūrāsana

---

2348. आसनमप्युक्तं विष्णुपुराणे—एवं भद्रासनादीनां समास्थाय गुणैर्युतम्। इति। भाष्य° on यो. सू. II. 48. The half verse is विष्णुपु. VI. 7. 39.

(figure 72 p. 109). The Tejobindu Upaniṣad I. 23 (Adyar ed)[2349] holds 'that alone is (proper) āsana which makes continuous meditation on brahma possible; other postures only lead to discomfort.' It should not be supposed that one who seeks higher yogic disciplines must devote some time to āsanas and then pass on to the next stage. The āsanas are primarily meant for physical culture and eradication of diseases. If the individual yogin possesses a tolerably sound body he may proceed with prāṇāyāma and other aṅgas. Besides the postures, the practitioner of Yoga is asked to gaze steadily at the tip of his nose (Gītā VI. 13).

Some regulations are prescribed about the food to be taken or avoided by a seeker after Yoga and about the places where he is to practise. The Śāntiparva[2350] of the Mahābhārata provides that the yogin should subsist on cooked small particles of grains, or oilcakes and should avoid oily substances and even when subsisting on yāvaka (i. e. kulmāṣa or cooked barley grains) for long, he would still be strong; he should drink water and milk mixed together and should resort to caves. The Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa (q. by Kṛtyakalpataru on Mokṣa pp. 167–177) states 'The yogin should begin meditation in unoccupied spots, in forests, caves and should avoid practising Yoga in noisy places, near fire and water, in old cowsheds, where four roads meet, near a heap of dried leaves, on a river bank, in a cemetery or in a place where creeping creatures exist, in a dangerous place, near a well, near a caitya (funeral ground) or an anthill'. The same purāṇa says that he should not practise when his stomach is windy, or he is hungry or tired or when disturbed in mind, nor when it is very cold or hot or windy. The Devala Dharmasūtra[2351]

2349. सुखेनैव भवेद्यस्मिन्नजस्रं ब्रह्मचिन्तनम्। आसनं तद्विजानीयादन्यत्सुखविनाशनम्॥ तेजोबिन्दु-उप. I. 25.

2350. कणानां भक्षणे युक्तः पिण्याकस्य च भक्षणे। स्नेहानां वर्जने युक्तो योगी बलमवाप्नुयात्॥ भुञ्जानो यावकं रूक्षं दीर्घकालमरिन्दम। एकारामो विशुद्धात्मा योगी बलमवाप्नुयात्। पक्षान् मासानृतूंश्चैतान् सञ्चरंश्च गुहास्तथा। अपः पीत्वा पयोमिश्रा योगी बलमवाप्नुयात्॥ शान्ति. 289. 43–45 (cr. ed.) = 300. 43–45 चित्र. ed.) q. by कृत्यकल्प॰ (on मोक्ष pp. 173–176). Vide मार्कण्डेय (36. 48–50), ब्रह्मपुराण 234. 7–9, कूर्म II. 11. 47–52, स्कन्द, काशीखण्ड 41. 65–66, लिङ्गपु. I. 8. 79–84 for places to be avoided for yoga practice.

2351. देवतायतनशून्यागारगिरिकन्दरनदीपुलिनगुहाख्यानामन्यतमे शुचौ निराबाधे विविक्ते ... मनसा तच्चिन्तनं ध्यानम्। देवल q. by कृत्यकल्प॰ (मोक्ष p. 181). Compare श्वेता॰ उप. II. 10.

prescribes that a yogin should practise meditation in a shrine, empty house, mountain cave, on the sands of a river, in caves, or in a forest, in a pure spot free from danger. H. Y. P. I. 61 and 64 prescribe what foods to avoid and what foods may be eaten. The Goraksaśataka[2352] prescribes that the yogin should give up pungent, sour and salted food and should subsist on milk diet. The Gītā (VI. 16-17) says 'one cannot succeed in Yoga who eats too much nor one who observes total fast and Yoga removes pain for him who takes proper food and exercise. The Chān. Up. (VII. 26. 2) where Sanatkumāra gives instruction to Nārada about the Reality remarks 'Purity of the mind follows on purity of food &c. (āhāraśuddhau sattvaśuddhiḥ' &c.). Aparārka on Yāj. I. 154 quotes a long prose passage (on p. 221) from Hārīta "one should be pure and should subsist on a limited quantity of food that would be enough or useful for his purpose as the ācāryas say 'purity of mind ...food". It is clear that Hārīta takes the words 'āhāraśuddhau &c.' literally, while Śaṅkarācārya in his bhāṣya on Chān. takes āhāra to mean 'experience of objects of sense such as Śabda'.

Prāṇāyāma—It is this anga of Yoga that figures most in the works on Dharmaśāstra from the earliest times. Literally the word means 'restraint or pause of prāṇa'. Other synonymous words are 'prāṇasaṁyama' (note 2310) and 'prāṇasaṁrodha'. The important point is: What does 'Prāṇa' mean here. The word is derived from the root 'an' (to breathe) with the prefix 'pra'. The verb and its forms occur in the Ṛgveda as in I. 101. 5, X. 121. 3, X. 125. 4. In various passages of the Ṛg. prāṇa means simply 'breath' (as in I. 66. 1, III. 53. 21, X. 69. 6). In Ṛg. X. 90. 13 (prāṇād-vāyur-ajāyata) it is stated that Vāyu (air, wind) arose from the prāṇa of the primeval *puruṣa*. The word 'asu' also is used in the Ṛgveda in the sense of 'prāṇa' in I. 113. 16 (udhīrdhvam jīvo asur-na āgāt), I. 164. 4. We have both *prāṇana* (breath) and *jīvana* (life) in Ṛg. I. 48. 10 (addressed to Uṣas). Perhaps *apāna* is suggested in Ṛg. X. 189. 2 (antaścarati rocanāsya prāṇād-apānatī). All the five

---

2352. कट्वम्ललवणत्यागी क्षीरभोजनमाचरेत्। गोरक्षशतक 50; कट्वम्लतीक्ष्णलवणोष्णहरीतशाकसौवीरतैलतिलसर्षपमद्यमत्स्यान्। आजादिमांस-दधि-तक्रकुलत्थकोल-पिण्याक-हिङ्गुलशुनाद्यमपथ्यमाहुः॥ गोधूमशालियवषाष्टिकशोभनान्नं क्षीराज्यखण्डनवनीतसितामधूनि। शुंठीपटोलकफलादिकपञ्चशाकं मुद्गादि दिव्यमुदकं च यमीन्द्रपथ्यम्। पुष्टं सुमधुरं स्निग्धं गव्यं धातुप्रपोषणम्। मनोभिलषितं योग्यं योगी भोजनमाचरेत्। ह. यो. प्र. 61, 64-65.

names of prāṇas appear in pairs as in the note [2353] below from Tai. S. In the Tai. S. I. 7. 9. 2 occur the three words 'prāṇa, apāna and vyāna'. The Atharvaveda (in VIII. 1. 1) mentions 'prāṇāḥ' and 'apānāḥ' in the plural and 'asu', 'prāṇa' and 'āyuḥ' in VIII. 1. 3, all probably meaning 'life'. In the Upaniṣads, prāṇa becomes the vital force or principle of all beings, the representative or symbol of *brahma*; vide Bṛ. Up. I. 6. 3 (Prāṇo vā amṛtam, nāmarūpe satyam, tābhyām-ayam prāṇaśchannaḥ), Bṛ. Up. I. 5. 23, which, after quoting a verse that the sun rises from Prāṇa and sets in Prāṇa, goes on to say (tasmādekam-eva vratam caret, prāṇyāc-caiva-apānyācca, nen-mā pāpmā mṛtyur-āpnavad-iti) 'therefore one must observe only one vow, he should inhale and exhale with the (fearful) thought that otherwise, the Evil one, Death, might seize me'. Here it appears that we have the germ of the theory of the importance of prāṇāyāma. In Chān. Up. V. 18–24 it is stated that the five *āhutis* are offered to prāṇa, vyāna, apāna, samāna and udāna (in the words 'Prāṇāya svāhā' &c.) at the time of a meal and that one who knows the true meaning of Agnihotra and offerings offers it in all worlds, in all beings and in all selves. Even now these āhutis are taken before meals by brāhmaṇas, only the order of the five differs. Praśna II. 13 says:—'All this that is established in the three worlds is under the dominance of Prāṇa.' In Chān. Up. IV. 3. 3 Prāṇa is again given five names on account of its working in the different parts of the human body viz. prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, samāna and udāna (all five being named in the Tai. S.). It follows that some distinction among the operation of the five prāṇas must have been made at least a thousand years before the Christian era.

2353. प्राणापानौ मे पाहि समानव्यानौ मे पाह्युदानव्यानौ मे पाहि। तै. सं. I. 6. 3. 3. On this सायण has in the com. the clear and interesting note 'एक एव वायुः शरीरगतस्थानभेदात् कार्यभेदाच्च प्राणादिनामभिर्भिद्यते। स्थानभेदः कैश्चिदुक्तः। हृदि प्राणो गुदेऽपानः समानो नाभिसंस्थितः। उदानः कण्ठदेशस्थो व्यानः सर्वशरीरगः॥ इति। उच्छ्वास-निःश्वासौ प्राणव्यापारः। मलमूत्रयोरधः पातनमपानव्यापारः। भुक्तस्यान्नरसस्य शरीरे साम्येन नयनं समानव्यापारः। उद्गारहिक्कादिरुदानव्यापार। कृत्स्नासु शरीरनाडीषु व्याप्य प्राणापानवृत्त्योः सन्धिकाले शरीरस्य बलप्रदानं व्यानव्यापारः॥'. Then सायण relies on छा. उप. I. 3. 3 यद्वै प्राणिति स प्राणः यदपानिति सोऽपानः। अथ यः प्राणापानयोः सन्धिः स व्यानः। यो व्यानः सा वाक्. In connection with the parts of the animal to be offered in a sacrifice as प्रायश्चित्त, the तै. सं. (III. 4. 1. 3–4) states: पुरस्ताद्वै नाभ्यै प्राण उपरिष्टादपानो यावानेव पशुस्तस्यावद्यति।; यथा सम्राडेवाधिकृतान् विनियुङ्क्ते। एतान् ग्रामानेतान् ग्रामानधि-तिष्ठस्वेति। एवमेवैष प्राण इतरान् प्राणान् पृथक् पृथगेव संनिधत्ते। पायूपस्थेऽपानम्। चक्षुः-श्रोत्रे मुखनासिकाभ्यां प्राणः स्वयं प्रातिष्ठते। मध्ये तु समानः। एष ह्येतद्धुतमन्नं समं नयति प्रश्न III. 4–5.

In this work it is not necessary to enter upon an exhaustive discussion on prāṇa from the Upaniṣads. A controversy has gone on about the meaning of prāṇa and apāna. Caland, Keith, Dumont and a few others hold that 'prāṇa' means in the ancient Vedic literature 'expiration' and 'apāna' means 'inspiration', but that this meaning was revised in later days. On the other hand almost all Sanskrit commentators and writers and G. W. Brown, Edgerton and others hold the opposite view.[2354] The present author agrees with the latter view viz. that 'prāṇa' meant and means 'inhalation or thoracic breath', while 'apāna' means 'abdominal breath.' All scholars are agreed that these are certainly the meanings of the words prāṇa and apāna in all classical Sanskrit literature, the opposite view being confined to the ancient period even by those who hold that prāṇa and apāna meant respectively 'expiration' and 'inspiration'. We should as far as possible so construe all Upaniṣad passages as to yield the same sense consistently. The Praśna Up. (certainly an early Upaniṣad, though not among the earliest ones) contains the following interesting and rather decisive passage "just as the king appoints his officers saying '(each of) you should govern such and such villages', in the same way this prāṇa assigns to the other prāṇas separate spheres viz. apāna in the organs of excrement and generation, the prāṇa going in from the mouth and nose establishes himself (as king) in the eyes and ears, Samāna in the middle (of the spheres of Prāṇa and Apāna) i. e. in the navel, since it is he (Samāna) that carries the food offered (in the fire i. e. in the stomach) equally (to all bodily parts)."

Caland, Dumont and others who hold that the word 'prāṇa' in ancient Sanskrit literature means 'expiration', chiefly rely on Śaṅkarācārya's explanation of Chān.[2355] Up. I. 3. 3. (yadvai

2354. Vide Z. D. M. G. vol. 55 pp. 261-265 and vol. 56 pp. 556-558, J. A. O. S. vol. 39 (1919) pp. 104-112 on 'Prāṇa and Apāna' by G. W. Brown, J. A. O. S. vol. 77 (1957) pp. 46-47 by Prof. Dumont, J. A. O. S. vol. 78 (1958) pp. 51-57 (Prof. Dumont *versus* Prof. Edgerton).

2355. शंकराचार्य on छा. I. 3. 3 explains 'यद्वै पुरुषः प्राणिति मुखनासिकाभ्यां वायुं बहिर्निःसारयति स प्राणाख्यो वायोर्वृत्तिविशेषः, यदपानित्यपश्वसिति ताभ्यामेवान्तरा कर्षति वायुं सोऽपानाख्या वृत्तिः।'; vide also शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. II. 4. 42 (पञ्चवृत्तिर्मनोवद्व्यपदिश्यते) 'प्राणः प्राग्वृत्तिरुच्छ्वासादिकर्मा, अपानोऽर्वाग्वृत्तिर्निश्वासादिकर्मा। व्यानस्तयोः सन्धौ वर्तमानो वीर्यवत्कर्महेतुः। उदान ऊर्ध्ववृत्तिरुत्क्रान्त्यादिहेतुः। समानः समं सर्वेष्वङ्गेषु योऽन्नरसान्नयतीति।'. The गीता in IV. 29 'अपाने जुह्वति प्राणं प्राणेऽपानं तथापरे। प्राणापानगती रुद्ध्वा प्राणायामपरायणाः॥' appears to use the two words in a special sense.

prāṇiti sa prāṇo yad-apāniti sospānaḥ &c.). They hold that 'antarākarṣati vāyum' in Śaṅkarabhāṣya (on Chān. Up I. 3. 3) only mean 'inhaling'; but that expression is capable of meaning 'it draws the air into the inside of the body (i. e. in the abdomen) and what is more important, one has to note that the interpretation put on Śaṅkara's words here by Caland, Dumont and others is directly opposed to Śaṅkarācārya's own explanations in several other passages of the Upaniṣads, such as Bṛ. Up. I. 5. 3, III. 4. 1, Chān. Up. III. 13. 1–6, Kaṭha 5. 3; Praśna III. 4–5 (vide note 2353). The bhāṣya on Bṛ. Up. I. 5. 3 [2356] remarks 'Prāṇa is an activity of the heart which moves about in the mouth and nose and is so called because it is led forth; Apāna is a downward movement starting from the navel and is so called because it casts out urine and excreta'. On Praśna Up. III. 4 (quoted in n. 2353) the Śāṅkarabhāṣya says the same thing about Prāṇa and Apāna. Not only Śaṅkarācārya but a much earlier authority viz. the Dharmasūtra of Devala (mentioned by Śaṅkara, vide p. 1352 n. 2208 above) defines the working of Prāṇa and Apāna as done by Śaṅkarācārya in his bhāṣya on Bṛ. Up. I. 5. 3.

In the Yoga system (which is based on the Upaniṣads) prāṇa implies more than mere breath. It means vital energy, powers such as speech, eye, ear, *manas* in the body as well as in different forms in the universe. Its most perceptible manifestation in the human body is the movement of the lungs. The Y. S. inculcates on the yogic student the doctrine that by scientific control (as laid down in it) of prāṇa in the body it is possible to obtain control over the deep-seated (and ordinarily imperceptible) forces in human consciousness as well as in the external world.

2356. On बृह. उप. 1. 5. 3 'त्रीण्यात्मनेऽकुरुतेति मनो वाचं प्राणम्।... यः कश्च शब्दो वागेव सा। एषा ह्यन्तमायत्तैषा हि न प्राणोऽपानो व्यान उदानः समानोऽन इत्येतत्सर्वं प्राण एव ...।', the important भाष्य passage is अथ प्राण उच्यते। प्राणो मुखनासिकासञ्चारी हृदयवृत्तिः प्रणयनात्प्राणः। अपनयनान्मूत्रपुरीषादेरपानोऽधोवृत्तिः आनाभिस्थानः'; on प्रश्न III. 5 the relevant भाष्य on अपान is: अपानमात्मभेदं, मूत्रपुरीषाद्यपनयनं कुर्वंस्तिष्ठति संनिधत्ते।'; on कठोप. 5. 3 'ऊर्ध्वं प्राणमुन्नयत्यपानं प्रत्यगस्यति' the भाष्य is 'ऊर्ध्वं हृदयात्प्राणं प्राणवृत्तिं वायुमुन्नयत्यूर्ध्वं गमयति तथा अपानं प्रत्यगधो अस्यति क्षिपति यः इति वाक्यशेषः।'. This clearly shows that prāṇa is taken by the bhāṣya as meaning 'inhalation or thoracic breath' and apāna as 'abdominal breath' or 'exhalation'. तत्र ऊर्ध्वं नाभेर्गतो रेचनोच्छ्वासक्षरणोद्गारकर्मा प्राणः। अधो नाभेरुत्सर्गानन्दकर्मोऽपानः। देवल q. by कृत्यकल्प° (मोक्षकाण्ड p. 170); वनपर्व 213. 7 (चित्र° ed.) says 'बस्तिमूलं गुदं चैव पावकं समुपाश्रितः। वहन् मूत्रं पुरीषं चाप्यपानः परिवर्तते॥'.

The word 'prāṇāyama' does not occur in any of the principal Upaniṣads.[2357] But it occurs frequently in the Sūtras. For example, the Āp. Dh. S. provides that if a householder[2358] is still asleep when the sun rises he should fast and keep silent that day (till night) and observes that, according to some ācāryas, he should continue to perform prāṇāyāma till he feels exhausted (by way of penance). The Gaut. Dh. S. states that if animals other than dogs, snakes, frogs and cats pass between the teacher and the pupil when the latter has sat down before the former for study, he (pupil) should practise three prāṇāyāmas and should partake of some clarified butter (by way of prāyaścitta). Similarly, it provides that if a person smells the odour from the mouth of one that has drunk liquor, he should perform (as penance) three prāṇāyāmas and should partake of clarified butter and that if a Vedic student chances to see an impure person like a Cāṇḍāla, he should, after performing one Prāṇāyāma, look at the sun. Similarly, Baud. Dh. S. (IV. 1. 4-11, prose) provides prāṇāyāmas as expiation for several lapses.

The above examples show that in the times of the Sūtras (i. e. several centuries before the Christian era) the conception of prāṇāyāma had been so developed as to hold that it was a sort of penance and religious rite for removing the taint attaching to acts and omissions that were condemned by the then society. At this stage prāṇāyāma appears merely to have been a religious act independent of any theory about its being one of the eight aṅgas of yoga.

To the five prāṇas mentioned in Vedic literature, the Purāṇas and other medieval works added five more prāṇas with different[2359] names.

2357. In a श्लोक ten ancient and principal upaniṣads are enumerated 'ईश-केन-कठ-प्रश्न-मुण्ड-माण्डूक्य-तित्तिरि। ऐतरेयं च छान्दोग्यं बृहदारण्यकं तथा॥.'

2358. स्वपन्नभ्युदितोऽनाश्वान्वाग्यतोऽहस्तिष्ठेत्। आ तमितोः प्राणमायच्छेदित्येके। आप. ध. सू. II. 5. 12. 14-15; श्वनकुलसर्पमण्डूकमार्जाराणां त्र्यहमुपवासो विप्रवासश्च। प्राणायामा घृतप्राशनं चेतरेषाम्। गौ. I. 61; गन्धाघ्राणे सुरापस्य प्राणायामा घृतप्राशनं च। अशुचिं दृष्ट्वादित्यमीक्षेत प्राणायामं कृत्वा। गौ. 23. 6 and 22. Compare with गौ. 23. 6 मनु XI. 149 and with गौ. 23. 22 मनु V. 86.

2359. प्राणोऽपानः समानश्च उदानो व्यान एव च। नागः कूर्मस्तु कृकलो देवदत्तो धनञ्जयः॥...उद्गारे नाग आख्यातः कूर्म उन्मीलने तु सः। कृकलः क्षुतकार्येत्र देवदत्तो विजृम्भणे। धनञ्जयो महाघोषः सर्वगः स मृतेपि हि। इति यो दशवायूनां प्राणायामेन सिध्यति। लिङ्गपु. I. 8. 61, 65-66; compare योगयाज्ञवल्क्य (ed. by Mr. Diwanji) IV. 64-71 for the ten vāyus and their functions; वनपर्व 213. 16 (वहन्त्यन्नरसान् नाड्यो दशप्राणप्रचोदिताः) mentions the function of ten prāṇas. Vide Dr. B. N. Seal's 'the positive sciences of the ancient Hindus' (Longmans, Green, 1915) pp. 228-231 for explanation about these ten.

It is now proper to see how the Y. S. defines and explains prāṇāyāma. 'When the stability of posture has been assured (or secured) prāṇāyāma is the pause (lit. cutting off) in the movements of inhalation and exhalation'. The bhāṣya explains 'śvāsa' as 'drawing in of the air which is outside one's body' and 'praśvāsa' as the expelling of the air in the trunk (or chest)' and the absence of both these is prāṇāyāma. This shows that the chief element in prāṇāyāma is the absence of both inhalation and exhalation i. e. *kumbhaka* in the technical language of yoga works. The next sūtra states that prāṇāyāma (the pause in movement) is of three kinds, viz. external, internal and suppressed. The idea is that Kumbhaka (stopping or pause) may be done after one has taken in air from outside (first kind) or after one has expelled air from the trunk (2nd kind) or when one is in a normal condition (i. e. neither making an effort to fill his chest with air or emptying it of air) one may make a pause (3rd kind). Each of these may be regulated and considered from the point of the units of space, time (measurement by *kalās* or *mātrās*) and numbers. Prāṇāyāma is called *mṛdu* (mild) when pause is kept up for 36 mātrās, then moderate one when kept up for 72 mātrās and keen (*tīvra*) when kept up for 108 mātrās. When practised for days, fortnights and months, it is called protracted and when performed with great skill it is called sūkṣma (subtle).

In connection with prāṇāyāma we must look to Y. S. I. 34 also. That sūtra lays down that for securing the undisturbed calm of the mind one remedy is the expulsion and retention of the breath.[2360] It appears from that sūtra and its bhāṣya that *vidhāraṇa* (retention of breath, i. e. Kumbhaka) is prāṇāyāma.

Some explanation must be offered about *deśa* (space), *kāla* and *saṅkhyā* in relation to prāṇāyāma. Ordinarily a healthy grown-up man breathes in and out in about four seconds i. e. about 15 times a minute (21600 times in one day and night). In order to measure the force of the *recaka* a piece of cotton or a thin thread is held at some distance from the nostrils and the distance up to which the air driven from the nostrils makes the cotton or thread move or cease to move is measured by means of finger-breadths. As regards time several units of time are mentioned because in those ancient days there was no scientific

2360. प्रच्छर्दन-विधारणाभ्यां वा प्राणस्य। यो. सू. I. 34; कौष्ठ्यस्य वायोर्नासिकापुटाभ्यां प्रयत्नविशेषाद्वमनं प्रच्छर्दनं विधारणं प्राणायामस्ताभ्यां वा मनसः स्थितिं सम्पादयेत्। भाष्य.

apparatus. The time taken for winking (*nimeṣa*) is equal[2361] to the time required for pronouncing a short vowel and this was called *mātrā*. The time taken for touching one's knees thrice with one's hand and snapping the thumb and forefinger was also called mātrā. Other units are passed over. The general rules are that both *recaka* and *pūraka* must be uniform and quiet, that the time given for pūraka should be half of that given to recaka. Three views about the duration of *pūraka*, *kumbhaka* and *recaka* are that they should be in the proportion of 1 : 4 : 2 or 1 : 2 : 2 or the same for all. The Purāṇas give different mātrās for prāṇāyāmas e. g. the Mārkaṇḍeya (36. 13, 14) says that the *laghu* (*mṛdu* of the bhāṣya) is of twelve mātrās, double of that is *madhyama* and the *uttarīya* (tīvra in the bhāṣya) is for three times twelve mātrās, while the Garuḍapurāṇa (I. 226. 14–15) puts down the figures as 10, 20, 30 respectively and the Kūrmapurāṇa (II. 11. 32) agrees with the Mārkaṇḍeya. The Mitākṣarā on Yāj. III. 200-201 provides that prāṇāyāma is of three varieties (adhama of 15 mātrās, madhyama of 30 mātrās and uttama of 45 mātrās). The Liṅgapurāṇa (I. 8. 47–48) also puts forth 12, 24, 36 mātrās as the time of *nīca udghāta*, *madhyama udghāta* and *mukhya* and states that obvious results of these three are respectively perspiration, tremor and utthāna (prasāda-kampanotthāna-janakaśca yathākramam). Compare Mārk. 36. 16 which states that those three are to be mastered respectively by the different lengths of prāṇāyāma (prathamena jayet svedam madhyamena ca vepathum । viṣādam hi tṛtīyena jayed-doṣān anukramāt ॥).

It should be noticed that neither Patañjali nor the Vyāsabhāṣya employs the well-known words, *pūraka*, *recaka* and

---

2361. निमेषकालतुल्यं हि विद्याल्लघ्वक्षरं च यत्। वायुपु. 57. 6; निमेषो मानुषो योयं मात्रामात्रप्रमाणतः । ब्रह्म 231. 6; निमेषोन्मेषणा मात्रा तालो लघ्वक्षरं तथा ॥ मार्कं० 36. 13 (Venk. ed.). विष्णुधर्मोत्तर I. 73. 1 लघ्वक्षरसमा मात्रा निमेषः; परिकीर्तितः। वाचस्पति says 'स्वजानुमण्डलं पाणिना त्रिः परामृश्य च्छोटिकावच्छिन्नः कालो मात्रा ताभिः षट्त्रिंशता मात्राभिः परिमितः प्रथमः उद्धातो मृदुः। स एव द्विगुणीकृतो द्वितीयो मध्यमः। स एव त्रिगुणीकृतस्तृतीयस्तीव्रः।' on यो. सू. II. 50; अङ्गुलिमोक्षत्रितयं जान्वोः परिमार्जनमथापि। तत्कालत्रयमपि तज्ज्ञा मात्रासंज्ञां प्रशंसन्ति॥ बृहद्योगिया. VIII. 12 q. as योगियाज्ञवल्क्य in कृत्यकल्प० (मोक्षकाण्ड p. 171). The गोरक्षशतक says 'प्राणायामो भवेत्त्रेधा मात्राद्वादशसंयुतः॥ द्वादशाधमके मात्रा मध्यमे द्विगुणस्ततः। उत्तमे त्रिगुणा मात्राः प्राणायामस्य निर्णयः॥ verses 47-48; vide वायुपु. 11. 80-81 मन्दो द्वादशमात्रस्तु उद्धाता द्वादश स्मृताः। मध्यमश्च द्विरुद्धातश्चतुर्विंशतिमात्रिकः॥ उत्तमः स्यात् त्रिरुद्धातो मात्राः षट्त्रिंशदुच्यते॥. The योगतत्त्वोपनिषद् (verses 41–42) lays down the proportion of the three (पूरक, कुम्भक and रेचक) is as 16, 64, 32 mātrās, while the गरुडपु. (I. 226. 14–15) speaks of 10, 20, 30 mātrās.

kumbhaka, but only śvāsa, praśvāsa and gativiccheda.[2362] Besides, Patañjali and Vyāsa say nothing about the japa of Om, Gāyatrī or Vyāhṛtis in prāṇāyāma, as the smṛtis and later medieval works do. A third matter to be considered is that in some later works recaka, pūraka and kumbhaka are said to be three prāṇāyāmas and this latter is said to be of four kinds, three set out in Y. S. II. 50 and the fourth in II. 51.

The words 'recaka', 'pūraka' and 'kumbhaka' also must be, however, regarded as ancient enough. They are mentioned and defined by the Dharmasūtra of Devala[2363] referred to by

---

2362. तस्मिन्सति श्वासप्रश्वासयोर्गतिविच्छेदः प्राणायामः । बाह्याभ्यन्तरस्तम्भवृत्तिर्देशकालसंख्याभिः परिदृष्टो दीर्घसूक्ष्मः । बाह्याभ्यन्तरविषयाक्षेपी चतुर्थः । यो. सू. II. 49-51; सत्यासनजये बाह्यस्य वायोराचमनं श्वासः कौष्ठ्यस्य वायोर्निःसारणं प्रश्वासः तयोर्गतिविच्छेदः उभयाभावः प्राणायामः । भाष्य on II. 49. The word वृत्ति is to be connected with each of the three words बाह्य, आभ्यन्तर and स्तम्भ. Here the कुम्भक that follows रेचक is called बाह्यवृत्ति and the one that comes after पूरक is called आभ्यन्तरवृत्ति. The कुम्भक that is made when there is neither रेचक nor पूरक is called स्तम्भवृत्ति. For an exhaustive and lucid exposition of the Pātañjala sūtras on prāṇāyāma, the bhāṣya thereon and the views of other commentators, vide Yogamīmāṁsā (of Shri Kuvalayānanda) vol. VI. pp. 44-54, 129-145, 225-257.

2363. देवलः । त्रिविधः प्राणायामः । कुम्भो रेचनं पूरणमिति । निश्वासनिरोधः कुम्भः । अजस्रनिःश्वासो रेचनम् । निश्वासाध्मानं पूरणमिति । स पुनरेकद्वित्रिभिरुद्वातै- (द्घातै?) र्मृदुर्मन्दस्तीक्ष्णो वा भवति । प्राणापानव्यानोदानसमानान् सकृदुद्गमनं मूर्धानमाहृत्य (हत्य!) निवृत्तिश्चोद्वातः (द्घातः?) । कृत्यकल्प० (मोक्षकाण्ड p. 170) and अपरार्क p. 1023. Compare व्यासभाष्य 'संख्याभिः परिदृष्टा एतावद्भिः श्वासप्रश्वासैः प्रथम उद्घातस्तद्वन्निगृहीतस्यैतावद्भिर्द्वितीय उद्घातः । एवं तृतीयः । एवं मृदुरेवं मध्य एवं तीव्र इति संख्यापरिदृष्टः' on यो. सू. II. 50. The राजमार्तण्ड explains 'उद्घातो नाम नाभिमूलात्प्रेरितस्य वायोः शिरस्यभिहननम्'. This word is differently explained by different writers; vide योगमीमांसा vol. II. part 3 pp. 225-234. Sometimes पूरक, रेचक and कुम्भक are said to be three प्राणायाम, sometimes all three together are deemed to be one प्राणायाम. Each of these again is either मृदु, मन्द (or मध्यम) and तीव्र. Vide बृहद्योगियाज्ञ. VIII. 7 त्रिविधं केचिदिच्छन्ति तथा च नवधा परे । मृदुमध्याधिमात्रत्वादेकैकं त्रिविधं भवेत् ॥. Vide विष्णुधर्मोत्तर III. 280. 1 रेचकं पूरकं चैव कुम्भकं च तथा द्विजाः । एकरूपव्यवस्थो विज्ञेयः प्राणायामो महाफलः ॥ रेचक-पूरक-कुम्भकेष्वस्ति श्वास-प्रश्वासयोर्गतिविच्छेद इति प्राणायामसामान्यलक्षणमेतदिति । तथाहि । यत्र बाह्यो वायुराचम्यान्तर्धार्यते पूरके तत्रास्ति श्वास-प्रश्वासयोर्गतिविच्छेदः । यत्रापि कौष्ठ्यो वायुर्विरेच्य बहिर्धार्यते तत्रास्ति श्वास-प्रश्वासयोर्गतिविच्छेदः । एवं कुम्भकेऽपीति । वाचस्पति on यो. सू. II. 50; पूरकः कुम्भकश्चैव रेचकस्तदनन्तरम् । प्राणायामस्त्रिधा ज्ञेयः कनीयो मध्यमोत्तमः ॥ पूरकः कुम्भको रेच्यः प्राणायामस्त्रिलक्षणः । बृहद्योगियाज्ञ. VIII. 9-10; the last half verse is quoted by स्मृतिच., I. p. 142 (as योगयाज्ञ.) and the three are defined in बृहद्योगियाज्ञ. VIII. 19-21 of which verse 19 is q. by स्मृतिच. I. p. 142. कुम्भक is so called because in it there is resemblance to a jar filled with water (which remains steady in it). राजमार्तण्ड explains 'तस्मिञ्जलमिव कुम्भे निश्चलतया प्राणा अवस्थाप्यन्ते इति कुम्भकः'. Vide पाणिनि V. 3. 97 'प्रतिकृतौ च'; इवार्थे कन् स्यात् समुदायेन चेत्संज्ञा गम्यते. So कुम्भक means कुम्भ इव कुम्भकः कुम्भसदृशस्य संज्ञा.

Śaṅkarācārya (vide note 2208 above). The Bṛhad-Yogi-Yāj. and Vācaspati also mention them. The Viṣṇupurāṇa in a poetic description of the Śarad season employs them by way of śleṣa[2364] (as below). Several modes of performing prāṇāyāma are prescribed. One of the simplest is to stop the right nostril with the thumb, to fill in air through the left nostril according to one's ability; then to throw out the air through the right nostril; again inhale through the right nostril and eject air through the left. Do this at least thrice. Practise this at least twice every day, preferably in the morning after bath and in the evening or four times (before dawn, during midday, in the evening or at midnight). In the beginning kumbhaka need not be practised at all. After some practice with pūraka and recaka, kumbhaka may be begun after recaka. Kumbhaka after pūraka is to be practised with great caution and should be attempted under the direction of an expert.

The Manusmṛti contains[2365] a great eulogy of prāṇāyāma in the following words 'even three prāṇāyāmas performed according to the rules prescribed and accompanied by the vyāhṛtis and *praṇava* (the syllable *om*) should be regarded as the highest *tapas* for a brāhmaṇa; just as in the case of metals (like gold and silver) impurities are burnt when they are melted in the blast of a furnace, so blemishes (like passion &c.) of the organs of sense (including the mind) are destroyed by the control of breath; one should extinguish the blemishes (passion, hatred &c.) by prāṇāyāmas, sin by *dhāraṇā*, contact with the objects of sense by *pratyāhāra* and such attributes as are ungodly (viz. anger, avarice, jealousy &c.) by meditation (on brahma). The Y. S. states that from the practice of prāṇāyāma results the dwindling of actions (or kleśas) that envelop enlightenment (which is the characteristic of *sattva*) and the

---

2364. प्राणायाम इवाम्भोभिः सरसां कृतपूरकैः । अभ्यस्यतेऽनुदिवसं रेचकाकुम्भकादिभिः ॥ विष्णुपु. V. 10. 14.

2365. प्राणायामा ब्राह्मणस्य त्रयोऽपि विधिवत्कृताः । व्याहृतिप्रणवैर्युक्ता विज्ञेयं परमं तपः ॥ दह्यन्ते ध्मायमानानां धातूनां हि यथा मलाः । तथेन्द्रियाणां दह्यन्ते दोषाः प्राणस्य निग्रहात् ॥ प्राणायामैर्दहेद् दोषान् धारणाभिश्च किल्बिषम् । प्रत्याहारेण संसर्गान् ध्यानेनानीश्वरान् गुणान् ॥ मनुस्मृति VI. 70–72. All these are बृहद्योगिया. VIII. 29, 30, 32. The last verse occurs also in शङ्खस्मृति VII. 13, वायुपु. X. 93, भागवत III. 28, मार्कण्डेयपु. 36. 10=39, 10 B. I. ed.; it is quoted from मार्कण्डेय by कृत्यकल्प° (मोक्षकाण्ड p. 168), which explains 'दोषान् स्वेदवेपथुप्रभृतीन्, अनीश्वरान्, प्राकृतान्'. अपरार्क p. 990 explains 'अनीश्वरा गुणा रागद्वेषादयः'.

mind of the yogin becomes fit for fixed attention.[2366] The Gorakṣaśataka[2367] provides 'a yogin always eradicates diseases by āsana, sin by prāṇāyāma and mental disturbance by pratyāhāra'. The Smṛtis state that prāṇāyāmas have great efficacy in destroying sins. Manu XI. 248 (= Vasiṣṭha 26. 4, Baud. Dh. S. IV. 1. 31 and Śaṅkhasmṛti XII. 18-19) states 'sixteen prāṇāyāmas performed everyday for a month together with the *vyāhṛtis* and *praṇava* (om) purify even the murderer of a brāhmaṇa. Manu XI. 199 and 201 prescribe the performance of a single prāṇāyāma as a purification for light lapses or riding an ass or a camel and such incidents as being bitten by a dog, jackal, horse, camel, boar or man. Yāj. III. 305 prescribes the performance of a hundred prāṇāyāmas for the destruction of all sins, of upapātakas (lesser sins described in Yāj. III. 234–242) and of sins for which no specific prāyaścitta is provided. Manu II. 83 (=Vasiṣṭha X. 5 and Viṣṇudharmasūtra 55.83) states 'the one syllable (om) is (the representative of) the highest brahma and prāṇāyāmas are the highest *tapas*'.

It may interest readers to note that the great Jaina monk, ācārya Hemacandra, condemns prāṇāyāmas by saying that they allow no rest to the mind, that there is physical effort in pūraka, kumbhaka and recaka and that prāṇāyāma is an obstacle to *mukti*.[2368]

In kumbhaka performed after pūraka the nerves, heart and lungs are under strain and permanent damage to these may result from careless or hasty practice of kumbhaka after pūraka. Those suffering from lung or cardiac affections should not enter upon the practice of prāṇāyāma on their own initiative but must first consult an expert. Swami Vivekananda said long ago that all students of Yoga[2369] 'are expressly and earnestly reminded

---

2366. ततः क्षीयते प्रकाशावरणम्। धारणासु च योग्यता मनसः। यो. सू. II. 52–53; 'प्राणायामानभ्यस्यतोऽस्य योगिनः क्षीयते विवेकज्ञानावरणीयं कर्म। ...तथा चोक्तम्। तपो न परं प्राणायामात्ततो विशुद्धिर्मलानां दीप्तिश्च ज्ञानस्य। इति। भाष्य.

2367. आसनेन रुजो हन्ति प्राणायामेन पातकम्। विकारं मानसं योगी प्रत्याहारेण सर्वदा॥ गोरक्षशतक 54.

2368. तन्नाप्नोति मनः स्वास्थ्यं प्राणायामैः कदर्थितम्। प्राणस्यायमने पीडा तस्य स्याच्चित्तविप्लवः॥ पूरणे कुम्भने चैव रेचने च परिश्रमः। चित्तसंक्लेशकरणान्मुक्तेः प्रत्यूहकारणम्॥ योगशास्त्र of हेमचन्द्र, 6th प्रकाश verses 4–5 (pub. in जैनग्रन्थमाला, Surat, *Vikrama* Saṁvat 1995).

2369. Vide p. 123 Vol. I of the complete works of Swami Vivekānanda, Mayāvatī ed. of 1946. Vide a similar warning given by Swami Kuvalayā-

(*Continued on next page*)

that with few exceptions Yoga can safely be learnt by direct contact with a teacher'. The fact, that the Yogasūtra containing 195 sūtras in all devotes only five sūtras (II. 49–53) to prāṇāyāma and that even these five are of a very general nature, indicates that Patañjali intended that the yogin should not practise prāṇāyāma by merely listening to or reading these sūtras but should approach an expert yogin for instruction and guidance.

It should be noticed that Patañjali does not require in his definition of prāṇāyāma the mental or inaudible repetition of any syllable like 'om' or any mantra like the Gāyatrī. But the Smṛtis prescribe the practice of prāṇāyāma every day in the Sandhyāvandana. Yāj. (I. 22) prescribes [2370] that a man of the three higher varṇas must every day take a bath, perform *mārjana* (sprinkling water with kuśas) with the mantras (Ṛg. X. 9. 1–3 'āpo hi ṣṭhā &c.'), practise prāṇāyāma, worship of the sun and japa of Gāyatrī (Ṛg. III. 62. 10) and that prāṇāyāma comprises the *japa* three times of Gāyatrī preceded by the Vyāhṛtis, each being preceded by Om and followed by the *Śiras*. Prāṇāyāma as described by Yāj. is prescribed even in modern times for the morning and evening Sandhyā adorations. Prāṇāyāma with mental repetition of 'Om' or a 'mantra' is called 'sagarbha' [2371] or 'sabīja,' while prāṇāyāma not so accompanied

---

(*Continued from last page*)

nanda in 'Prāṇāyāma' part I. p. 66 and by Shree Purohit Swami in 'Aphorisms of Yoga' (London, 1938 p. 56). Figures 27 to 40 (pp. 68–89 in Shri Kuvalayānanda's popular handbook on Prāṇāyāma, part one) illustrate the three (pūraka &c.) in prāṇayāma of the best scientific type.

2370. स्नानमब्दैवतैर्मन्त्रैर्मार्जनं प्राणसंयमः। सूर्यस्य चाप्युपस्थानं गायत्र्याः प्रत्यहं जपः। गायत्रीं शिरसा सार्धं जपेद् व्याहृतिपूर्विकाम्। प्रतिप्रणवसंयुक्तां त्रिरयं प्राणसंयमः॥ याज्ञ. I. 22–23. The second verse occurs in वसिष्ठ 25. 13, बृहद्योगियाज्ञ. VIII. 3, अत्रिसंहिता verse 298. The whole japa for प्राणायाम would be ओं भूः ओं भुवः ओं स्वः ओं महः ओं जनः ओं तपः ओं सत्यं ओं तत्सवितुर्वरेण्यं भर्गो देवस्य धीमहि। धियो यो नः प्रचोदयात्। ओं आपो ज्योती रसोऽमृतं ब्रह्मभूर्भुवः स्वरोम्। This has to be repeated thrice in the सन्ध्यावन्दन. The words आपो ज्यो ... रोम् are called शिरः of गायत्री. Vide बृहद्योगियाज्ञ. VIII. 4–6 q. by स्मृतिच. I p. 141 as योगयाज्ञ.

2371. अगर्भश्च सगर्भश्च द्वितीयस्तु ततो वरः। जपध्यानं विनाऽगर्भः सगर्भस्तत्समन्वितः॥ कूर्म II. 11. 31 mentions these two. प्राणाख्यमनिलं वश्यमभ्यासात्कुरुते तु यः। प्राणायामः स विज्ञेयः सबीजोऽबीज एव च॥ विष्णुपु. VI. 7. 40 q. by वाचस्पति on यो. सू. II. 52 and by अपरार्क p. 1022 (which explains सबीजः समन्त्रकः, अबीज इतरः). Vide also कूर्म II. 46. 40–41 'आरुरुक्षुस्तु सगुणं पूजयेत्परमेश्वरम्। पिनाकिनं त्रिनयनं जटिलं कृत्तिवाससम्। रुक्माभं वा सहस्रार्कांश्चिन्तयेद्योगवित्सदा। एष योगः समुद्दिष्टः सबीजो मुनिपुङ्गवाः॥'.

is called 'agarbha' or 'abīja' and it is said that 'sagarbha' is the better of the two. Śāntīparva (304. 9. cr. ed. = Ch. ed. 316. 9–10) speaks of saguṇa and nirguṇa prāṇāyāma. The Yogabhāṣya (on Y. S. II. 52) quotes a passage [2372] 'there is no higher tapas than prāṇāyāma, therefrom arises purification of the taints and knowledge flashes forth.'

The H. Y. P. speaks of eight kinds of Prāṇāyāma (in II. 44). The two most important ones, viz Ujjāyī and Bhastrikā are described by Śrī Kuvalayānanda in chap. IV. pp. 67–68 and chap. VI. pp. 101–115 respectively in his handbook on Prāṇāyāma, part one and the other six viz. Sūryabhedana, Sītkārī, Śītalī, Bhrāmarī, Mūrcchā, Plāvinī in. pp. 6–25 of the handbook part 2. H. Y. P. (II. 48–70) describes all the eight at some length.

Dr. Rele in his work 'Mysterious Kundalinī' provides at the very beginning a diagram of the autonomic nervous system according to the Western anatomical science, showing the six cakras and identifying the positions of these six and the sahasrāracakra (lit. thousand-petalled i. e. having numberless petals). He propounded an original view that the Kuṇḍalinī is the right vagus nerve. His book is very interesting and he has explored a very large field of yogic practices. He has very thoroughly utilized his deep knowledge of Western anatomy and physiology, but he himself admits in his preface (p. 2) that the explanations of the various Yogic practices and phenomena given by him are possible suggestions only. But it may be noted that Sir John Woodroffe, who made a deep study of Yoga and of Tantra works and who wrote a foreword to Dr. Rele's work, was not prepared to accept Dr. Rele's identification of Kuṇḍalinī with the right Vagus Nerve (p. ii) and holds that Kuṇḍalinī is not a nerve or any other physical substance or mental faculty but rather the Ground Substance of both (Foreword p. iii). Similarly, Shri Kuvalayānand (in his popular handbook on prāṇāyāma part 1, p. 57 n. 3), after referring to Dr. Rele's admission about his explanations being possible suggestions only, points out that Dr. Rele had not tried a single experiment in the laboratory nor had he taken much care to consult the practical experience of the students of Yoga and he states that to him the whole book of Dr. Rele seems to be of doubtful scientific value. He goes further and asserts that Swami

2372. तथा चोक्तम् । तपो न परं प्राणायामात्ततो विशुद्धिर्मलानां दीप्तिश्च ज्ञानस्य । इति । योगभाष्य on II. 52; compare विष्णुधर्मोत्तर III. 280. 4 प्राणायामात्परं नास्ति द्विजातीनां तथा तपः ।.

Vivekananda's lectures on Rājayoga suffer from the same drawbacks as the work of Dr. Rele does. Śrī Kuvalayānand shows (on pp. 121–126) the value of prāṇāyāma for physical health and the proper functioning of the lungs, the organs of digestion, the liver, pancreas and kidneys and asserts that the spiritual value of Prāṇāyāma is very great.

Pratyāhāra (withdrawal of the sense organs from the objects of sense) is defined[2373] in Y. S. II. 54 as 'when the senses have no contact with (are withdrawn from) their objects (because the mind is restrained) and thereby resemble the state of the mind itself, there is pratyāhāra.' When the mind, being restrained by the yogin, does not come in contact with the objects of sense, viz. sound, touch, form, taste, smell, the organs of sense also become disconnected with them, the organs come to resemble the mind itself (hence the words 'anukāra iva' in the sūtra). From this (non-contact) results the complete mastery over the senses. The idea is that in restraining the mind from the objects of sense the organs also are withdrawn from contact with them. Since the mind is made *ekāgra* (one-pointed) the sense organs together with the mind do not cognise or apprehend the objects. Pratyāhāra is the checking of the outgoing activities of the mind and freeing it from being the slave of the senses. The Śāntiparva (cr. ed. 188. 5-7 = Ch. ed. 195. 6–7) speaks of it. The Viṣṇupurāṇa in V. 10. 14 (in describing Śarad, i. e. autumn, states 'Śarad removed the turbidness of waters as pratyāhāra withdraws the organs from their objects') refers to pratyāhāra[2374]

2373. स्वविषयासंप्रयोगे चित्तस्वरूपानुकार इवेन्द्रियाणां प्रत्याहारः । ततः परमा वश्यतेन्द्रियाणाम् । यो. सू. II. 54–55. The word प्रत्याहार is formed from the root हृ with प्रति and आ. The राजमार्तण्ड explains 'इन्द्रियाणि विषयेभ्यः प्रतीपमाहियन्तेऽस्मिन्निति प्रत्याहारः'. The word प्रत्याहार literally means 'bringing back'. The भाष्य explains 'स्वविषयसंप्रयोगाभावे चित्तस्वरूपानुकार इवेति चित्तनिरोधे चित्तवन्निरुद्धानीन्द्रियाणि नेतरेन्द्रियजयवदुपायान्तरमपेक्षन्ते । यथा मधुकरराजं मक्षिका उत्पतन्तमनूत्पतन्ति निविशमानमनु निविशन्ते तथेन्द्रियाणि चित्तनिरोधे निरुद्धानीत्येष प्रत्याहारः ।'. The illustration of the queen bee and the honey-making bees occurs in Praśna Up. II. 4 'तद्यथा मक्षिका मधुकरराजानमुत्क्रामन्तं सर्वा एवोत्क्रामन्ते तस्मिंश्च प्रतिष्ठमाने सर्वा एव प्रातिष्ठन्ते । एवं वाङ्मनश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं च ।' This sūtra is variously interpreted but the bhāṣya follows the view of Jaigiṣavya.

2374. शब्दादिष्वनुषक्तानि निगृह्याक्षाणि योगवित् । कुर्याच्चित्तानुकारीणि प्रत्याहारपरायणः ॥ वश्यता परमा तेन जायते निश्चलात्मनाम् । इन्द्रियाणामवश्यैस्तैर्न योगी योगसाधकः ॥ विष्णुपु. VI. 7. 43–44. These are also quoted by कृत्यकल्प॰ (मोक्षकाण्ड p. 173) and by अपरार्क p. 1025. The मार्क॰ पु. (39. 41 of Cal. ed. = 36, 41–42 of Venk. edition) says 'शब्दादिभ्योऽनिवृत्तानि यदक्षाणि यतात्मभिः । प्रत्याह्रियन्ते योगेन प्रत्याहारस्ततः स्मृतः ॥ q. by कृत्यकल्प॰ (मोक्ष p. 173).

as 'Indriyāṇīndriyārthebhyaḥ pratyāhāra ivāharat'.| Vācaspati quotes two verses from the Viṣṇupurāṇa which employ the very characteristic words of the Y. S. and probably borrow the idea and language from the Y. S. The Dharmasūtra of Devala[2375] explains pratyāhāra as 'establishing (*or yoking*) the mind to the soul by bringing it back (to the soul) when it has swerved from the path of Yoga, because of its subtlety, its restlessness, its thoughtlessness or its force'. The Kūrmapurāṇa[2376] defines it as 'the suppression or mastery over the organs of sense that are naturally attracted to objects of sense'. Vide Śāntiparva (cr. ed. 232. 13) also.

It appears that when the Chān. Up. (in VIII. 15) enumerates the circumstances which enable a person to reach the worlds of *brahman* it has an idea of pratyāhāra in the word 'ātmani sarvendriyāṇi sampratisthāpya' ('when he concentrates all his senses in the self').

The third pāda of the Y. S. is called 'Vibhūti-pāda' (pāda that deals with the super-normal powers of the yogin). The word 'vibhūti' occurs in Praśna 5. 4 where it is stated that he who contemplates on Om of the dvimātra type is taken to the world of the moon where he enjoys 'vibhūti' and again returns to the earth. There the word probably means nothing more than prosperous life. The third *pāda* first deals with the last three of the eight aṅgas of Yoga, the first five being called *bahiraṅga* (indirect helpers of samprajñāta-samādhi), while the last three are said to be *antaraṅga* of samprajñāta-samādhi (but even these three are bahiraṅga with reference to nirbīja Yoga, as the latter may occur even in the absence of the three 'dhāraṇā' &c. These three are called dhāraṇā, dhyāna and samādhi and these three when practised on the same object are called saṁyama, which is a technical term in the Yoga system. Vibhūtis are the results of saṁyama of various kinds. Instead of employing the three words dhāraṇā, dhyāna and samādhi Patañjali employs expressly or impliedly the word 'saṁyama' in most of the sūtras from 16 to 52 of the 3rd *pāda*.

2375. अणुत्वाच्चापलत्वाल्लाघवाद्बलवत्त्वाद्वा योगभ्रष्टस्य मनसः पुनः प्रत्यानीयात्मनि योजनं प्रत्याहारः । देवल q. by कृत्यकल्प० (मोक्ष० p. 173); अपरार्क p. 1025 ascribes this sūtra to हारीत and reads 'अणुत्वाल्लाघवाच्चापलाद्वा योगभ्रष्टस्य ... प्रत्याहारः' (we should read °लाद्वा योग°). कृत्यकल्प० (मोक्ष० p. 173) explains '[illegible]'.

2376. इन्द्रियाणां विचरतां विषयेषु स्वभावतः । निग्रहः प्रोच्यते सद्भिः प्रत्याहारस्तु सत्तम ॥ कूर्म II. 11. 38. स्कन्द, काशीखण्ड 41. 101 'इन्द्रियाणां हि चरतां विषयेषु यदृच्छया । बलस्याहरणं बुद्ध्या प्रत्याहारः स उच्यते ॥. बुद्ध्या means '[illegible]'.

Dhāraṇā, dhyāna and samādhi are said to be the direct auxiliaries of Yoga and are three successive stages, the preceding one leading to the next. Dhāraṇā is the holding of the mind to a certain spot or point [2377] or object. The bhāṣya explains that the mind is to be held down to such spots (in one's body) as the navel, the heart-lotus, the head, the light (in the eye), the tip of the nose, the tip of the tongue and the like or on external objects (such as images of gods in various forms). In this stage attention has to be firmly held upon the chosen object for a period of time determined by the will of the yoga aspirant. In this stage there are three elements, the subject, the object and the act of concentration. The next stage is dhyāna, which will be described immediately below. The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa speaks of ten dhāraṇās on the different parts of the yogin's own body [2378] and is in accordance with the plural 'dhāraṇāsu ca yogyatā manasaḥ' (in Y. S. II. 53) employed by Patañjali himself. The Āśvamedhikaparva also employs the plural 'dhāraṇāsu'. Vide the Śāntiparva (cr. ed. 188. 8-12 = Ch. ed. 195.8). The Yājñavalkyasmṛti [2379] in a succint manner brings

---

2377. देशबन्धश्चित्तस्य धारणा। तत्र प्रत्ययैकतानता ध्यानम्। यो. सू. III. 1, 2; the भाष्य on these is: नाभिचक्रे हृदयपुण्डरीके मूर्ध्नि ज्योतिषि नासिकाग्रे जिह्वाग्र इत्येवमादिषु देशेषु बाह्ये वा विषये चित्तस्य वृत्तिमात्रेण बन्ध इति धारणा। तस्मिन्देशे ध्येयालम्बनस्य प्रत्ययस्यैकतानता सदृशः प्रवाहः प्रत्ययान्तरेणापरामृष्टो ध्यानम्।. The लिङ्गपु I. 8. 42-43 appears to echo the words of यो. सू. in 'चित्तस्य धारणा प्रोक्ता स्थानबन्धः समासतः। ... तत्रैकचित्तताध्यानं प्रत्ययान्तरवर्जितम्।.' The Upaniṣads speak of the heart as lotus (vide above note 1717 and शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. I. 3. 14-21 दहर उत्तरेभ्यः &c.). ज्योतिषि probably refers to the Puruṣa in the eye (as in छा. VIII. 7. 4 or IV. 15. 1 (य एषोऽक्षिणि पुरुषो दृश्यत एष आत्मेति होवाच) or the Lord in one's heart; वाचस्पति explains बाह्ये वा विषये by quoting several verses of the विष्णुपुराण VI. 7. 77-85 where it speaks of contemplation on the form of Viṣṇu with a benign face, lotus-like eyes, wearing ear-rings and having the Śrīvatsa jewel on his chest, with four or eight long arms, wearing a yellow garment and holding conch, śārṅga bow, mace.

2378. प्राङ्नाभ्यां हृदये चाथ तृतीये च तथोरसि। कण्ठे मुखे नासिकाग्रे नेत्रभ्रूमध्यमूर्धसु॥ किंचित्तस्मात्परस्मिंश्च धारणा परमा स्मृता। दशैता धारणाः प्राप्य प्राप्नोत्यक्षरसाम्यताम्॥ मार्कण्डेय (36. 44-45 = 39. 44-45, Cal. ed.), गरुडपु (I. 226. 21-22) q. by अपरार्क p. 1023 and कृत्यकल्प० (मोक्ष० p. 173). Compare कूर्म 'हृत्पुण्डरीके नाभ्यां वा मूर्ध्नि पर्वसु मस्तके। एवमादिषु देशेषु धारणा चित्तबन्धनम्॥' II. 11. 39; तथैव युञ्जते योगी धारणासु समाहितः। प्राप्नोत्याशु परं स्थानं लक्ष्यमुक्त इवाशुगः॥ आश्वमेधिक 19. 37.

2379. ऊरुस्थोत्तानचरणः सव्ये न्यस्योत्तरं करम्। उत्तानं किंचिदुन्नाम्य मुखं विष्टभ्य चोरसा। निमीलिताक्षः सत्त्वस्थो दन्तैर्दन्याननसंस्पृशन्। तालुस्थाचलजिह्वश्च संवृतास्यः सुनिश्चलः। संनिरुध्येन्द्रियग्रामं नातिनीचोच्छ्रितासनः। द्विगुणं त्रिगुणं वापि प्राणायाममुपक्रमेत्। ततो ध्येयः स्थितो योऽसौ हृदये दीपवत्प्रभुः। धारयेत्तत्र चात्मानं धारणां धारयन्

(*Continued on next page*)

in the aṅgas from āsana to dhāraṇā and dhyāna as follows: (The yogin) occupying a seat neither too high nor too low, having placed his upturned heels on his thighs and having placed on the left (palm placed on the upturned right heel) his other (right) palm (turned upwards), having slightly raised his face and having braced up his body with his (raised) chest, having closed the eyes, being free from *rajas* and *tamas*, not allowing the upper and lower rows of teeth to touch, holding his tongue firmly in the palate, and allowing no shaking of the body, covering the mouth, holding back the organs of sense from their objects, should perform prāṇāyāma of the twofold or threefold type (of 24 or 36 mātrās), should contemplete on the Lord that occupies his heart like a lamp, and fix his mind on that Lord by way of Dhāraṇā. Devala states [2380] that dhāraṇā is the holding in check of the body, senses, mind, intellect and ātman (egoism).

M. Charles Baudouin in 'Suggestion and auto-suggestion' tr. by Elder and Cedar Paul (ed. of 1922, Allen and Unwin) says (on p. 150) 'As one of the curiosities of history and further as a lesson in humility we must point out that the states just described under the names of collectedness, contention and auto-hypnosis are described with considerable psychological acumen (though not in modern psychological terminology) in the precepts by which for centuries past the Yogis of Hindustan have been accustomed to attain to self-mastery' and the author refers to Pratyāhāra and Dhāraṇā in this connection and on p. 151 remarks that auto-hypnosis is encountered in Yoga but it is tinged with mysticism because the sacred word 'om' is repeated hundreds of times.

Dhyāna (contemplation) is the one-pointedness (continuous flow) of the apprehension of the object contemplated upon,

---

(Continued from last page)

बुधः ॥ याज्ञ. III. 198–201. These except the last are quoted by कृत्यकल्प° (मोक्षकाण्ड p. 180) and occur in स्कन्द, काशीखण्ड 41. 69–71 and the last (verse 201) is q. by कृत्यकल्प° (मोक्ष on p. 194). Vide figure 16 in Shri Kuvalayānanda's handbook on 'Āsanas' (pp. 54–55) for पद्मासन. These verses in या. are commented upon by Viśvarūpa, the Mitākṣarā and Aparārka. Therefore they cannot be said to be later interpolations.

2380. शरीरेन्द्रियमनोबुद्ध्यात्मनां धारणाद्धारणा ।, देवल q. by अपरार्क p. 1025, कृत्यकल्प° (मोक्ष p. 174). अपरार्क says 'अत्रात्माहंकारः; the कृत्यकल्प° says nothing on आत्मा.

unaffected by any other idea or apprehension. The Upaniṣads[2381] insist upon dhyāna, e. g. Muṇḍaka says 'contemplate upon the Self in the form of Om'; the Bṛ. Up. has the famous passage 'the self should be seen, heard, understood and reflected upon.' The Chān. Up. (VII. 6. 2) employs the word 'dhyāna' in the sense of 'concentrating all thoughts on one object'. The Śv. Up. (I. 3) mentions dhyānayoga and also Gītā 18. 52 does so (dhyānayoga-paro nityam). The Śāntiparva (cr. ed. 188. 13 ff = Ch. ed. 195. 13-18) speaks of dhyāna. The Kṛtyakalpataru (on Mokṣa p. 181) quotes a long prose passage from Devala-dharmasūtra about dhyāna. The Viṣṇupurāṇa[2382] closely agreeing with the Yogabhāṣya in phraseology describes dhyāna as the one-pointed succession of the apprehension of the Lord's form, unmixed with another idea, brought about by the practice of the first six aṅgas of Yoga. Aparārka (pp. 1025-27) quotes a long prose passage from Viṣṇudharmasūtra (chap. 97), which asks the yogin to contemplate upon the all-pervading and all-powerful Lord who is free from guṇas (sattva, rajas, tamas), is beyond the twenty-four tattvas and who is imperceptible to the senses, and that, if he be unable to focuss his mind on formless God all at once, to

---

2381. आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः। बृह. उप. II. 4, 5; ओमित्येवं ध्यायथ आत्मानम्। मुण्डक II. 2. 6. निदिध्यासितव्यः is the potential passive participle of the desiderative form of ध्यै with नि.; The छा. उप. VII. 6 is 'ध्यानं वाव चित्ताद्भूयः। ध्यायतीव पृथिवी ... ध्यायन्तीव देवमनुष्याः। तस्माद्य इह मनुष्याणां महत्तां प्राप्नुवन्ति ध्यानापादांशा इवैव ते भवन्ति। ... ध्यानमुपास्स्वेति। The earth is motionless, just as a yogin when deep in contemplation is motionless and therefore it is said "the earth is as it were engaged in contemplation."

2382. तद्रूपप्रत्ययैकाग्र्यसन्ततिश्चान्यनिःस्पृहा। तद् ध्यानं प्रथमैरङ्गैः षड्भिर्निष्पाद्यते नृप॥ विष्णुपु. VI. 7. 91 q. by वाचस्पति, कृत्यकल्प॰ (मोक्षकाण्ड p. 175) and अपरार्क p. 1026 who explains 'ब्रह्मरूपप्रत्ययात्मिका सन्ततिः प्रवाहः सा विषयान्तरासंसृष्टा सती ध्यानमित्युच्यते।'; सगुणं वर्णभेदेन निर्गुणं केवलं मतम्। समन्त्रं सगुणं विद्धि निर्गुणं मन्त्रवर्जितम्॥ स्कन्द, काशी॰ 41. 120. One verse from नृसिंहपुराण is repeated even now in worship viz. ध्येयः सदा सवितृमण्डलमध्यवर्ती नारायणः सरसिजासन-संनिविष्टः। केयूरवान् मकरकुण्डलवान् किरीटी हारी हिरण्मयवपुर्धृतशङ्खचक्रः॥ 26. 17 q. by कृत्यकल्प॰ (मोक्ष p. 192); हृत्स्थस्य ध्यानयोगेन देवदेवस्य दर्शनम्। ध्यानं प्रोक्तं प्रवक्ष्यामि ध्यानयोगमतः शुभम्॥ शङ्खस्मृति VII. 16. This is followed by seven verses, two of which are अणोरणीयान् and वेदाहमेतं (VII. 20 and 23) that are the same as श्वेताश्व. उप. III. 20 and 8 respectively, and all the eight verses are q. by कृत्यकल्प॰ (मोक्ष p. 193). The editor did not identify them from शङ्ख; बहिर्मुखानि सर्वाणि कृत्वा चान्तर्मुखानि वै। मनसैवेन्द्रियग्रामं मनश्चात्मनि योजयेत्। सर्वभावविनिर्मुक्तं क्षेत्रज्ञं ब्रह्मणि न्यसेत्। एतज्ज्ञानं च ध्यानं च शेषोऽन्यो ग्रन्थविस्तरः॥ दक्षस्मृति VII. 20-21. These and the following five verses are q. by कृत्यकल्प॰ (मोक्ष॰ pp. 207-208) which the editor did not identify. The verse सर्वभाव ... विस्तरः is q. by अपरार्क p. 970 (reads एतद् ध्यानं च योगश्च).

gradually rise up from Pṛthvī and the other elements, mind, intellect, the soul, avyakta (unmanifested Spirit); if he be unable to do even this he should contemplate on the person that is like a lamp in his own heart (lotus); if this is impossible, he should contemplate upon the form of Vasudeva having on his chest vanamālā, having four arms, holding the conch, the quoit, mace and lotus; and adds that he secures whatever he contemplates upon and that this is the secret of dhyāna. This shows that dhyāna is either *saguṇa* or *nirguṇa* as stated by the Padmapurāṇa IV. 84. 80–86 (nirguṇa) and IV. 84. 88–96 (*saguṇa*) or *sākāra* and *nirākāra* (Padmapurāṇa, II. 80. 70, 77–78). The Viṣṇupurāṇa (VI. 7. 78–90) contains a passage similar to the Viṣṇu Dh. S. Skanda (Kāśīkhaṇḍa, chap. 41. 19) speaks of dhyāna as saguṇa and nirguṇa and defines saguṇa as depending on different forms or as accompanied by repetition of mantras and nirguṇa as 'not depending on any particular form or as not accompanied by mantras'. The Narasiṁhapurāṇa (17. 11-28 and 26. 17) describes at some length the form in which Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu is to be contemplated upon and these verses are quoted by the Kṛtya-kalpataru (Mokṣa, pp. 191–192). The Śaṅkha-smṛti states that one has realization (*darśana*) of the Lord of gods that abides in the heart (of every person) by means of dhyānayoga and describes the mode of dhyāna. Dakṣasmṛti also emphasizes dhyāna and jñāna (correct knowledge) and states that description of others serves no purpose beyond adding to the bulk of the work. In this stage there is only the duality of subject and object, there is no awareness of effort to tie down the mind on an object (as in mere *dhāraṇā*).

Samādhi (concentration and absorption)—Dhyāna itself is Samādhi, when only the contemplated object shines forth and when dhyāna is as if emptied of its own form because there is no apprehension of dhyāna as distinct from *dhyeya*.[2383] When

---

2383. तदेवार्थमात्रनिर्भासं स्वरूपशून्यमिव समाधिः। त्रयमेकत्र संयमः। तदपि बहिरङ्गं निर्बीजस्य। यो. सू. III. 3, 4, 8. The भाष्य on these three is: ध्यानमेव ध्येयाकारनिर्भासं प्रत्ययात्मकेन स्वरूपेण शून्यमिव यदा भवति ध्येयस्वभावावेशात् तदा समाधिरित्युच्यते॥ तदेतद् धारणा-ध्यान-समाधि-त्रयमेकत्र संयमः। एकविषयाणि त्रीणि साधनानि संयम इत्युच्यते। तदस्य त्रयस्य तान्त्रिकी परिभाषा संयम इति॥ तदप्यन्तरङ्गं साधनत्रयं निर्बीजस्य योगस्य बहिरङ्गं भवति। कस्मात्। तदभावे भावात्।. The राजमार्तण्ड explains the word समाधि as सम्यगाधीयते एकाग्रीक्रियते विक्षेपान् परिहृत्य मनो यत्र स समाधिः।. The योगसुधाकर p. 118 (Kashi series, 1930) brings out the distinction between संप्रज्ञात and असंप्रज्ञात समाधि as follows: ब्रह्माकारमनोवृत्तिप्रवाहोऽहंकृतिं विना। संप्रज्ञातः समाधिः

(*Continued on next page*)

meditation is carried to a stage where the object contemplated upon alone appears and the meditator is not conscious of the idea of contemplation, because the object meditated upon entirely engulfs the meditator. The yogin becomes so much identified with the object meditated upon that he is not conscious that he is contemplating upon an object. This is what is meant by 'svarūpaśūnyam-iva' (in Y. S. III. 3). In Samādhi the subject and object, the individual and Paramātman are completely blended into one, so that the consciousness of the subject as separate from object disappears. The word 'Samādhi' does not occur in any of the ancient Upaniṣads, though it is known to the Maitrāyaṇī Up. (vide n. 2327 above). The word Samādhi occurs in the Bhagavadgītā (II. 53–54) and in Vanaparva (3. 11) and in Śāntiparva 195. 19–20, Ch. ed.). The Viṣṇupurāṇa[2384] provides that it is called Samādhi when the mind grasps as a result of dhyāna the real nature of that (the Paramātman) in which there is absence of the separate apprehension (of the object to be meditated upon, the act of meditation and the meditator). The three (dhāraṇā, dhyāna and samādhi) are direct aids in samprajñāta-samādhi but they are indirect aids in asamprajñātasamādhi, as this last may follow without these. The Haṭhayoga-pradīpikā [2385] states 'that is called Samādhi where there is equality and oneness of the individual self and the Highest Self and where all desires cease to exist'. *Sabīja* and *nirbīja* samādhis would be equal to savikalpa and nirvikalpa samādhi defined by the Vedāntasāra. There are several grades or stages in samādhi. There are four grades[2386] of Samprajñāta

---

(Continued from last page)

स्याद्ध्यानाभ्यासप्रकर्षतः। इति। ... परवैराग्यपूर्वकनिरोधप्रयत्नेन तस्यापि निरोधे सर्ववृत्तिनिरोधान्निर्बीजः समाधिर्भवति। तदुक्तम्। मनसो वृत्तिशून्यस्य ब्रह्माकारतया स्थितिः। याऽसंप्रज्ञातनामासौ समाधिरभिधीयते। इत्येष विभागो द्रष्टव्यः। योगसुधाकर of सदाशिवेन्द्रसरस्वती on यो. सू. III. 3.

2384. तस्यैव कल्पनाहीनं स्वरूपग्रहणं हि यत्। मनसा ध्याननिष्पाद्यं समाधिः सोऽभिधीयते॥ विष्णुपु. VI. 7. 92 q. by वाचस्पति, कृत्यकल्प॰ (मोक्ष p. 175), अपरार्क p. 1026 (who explains तस्य ब्रह्मणः कल्पनाहीनं ध्येयं ध्यानं ध्यातेति भेदप्रत्ययरहितं etc.). The लिङ्गपु. I. 8. 44 is 'चिद्भासमर्थमात्रस्य देहशून्यमिव स्थितम्। समाधिः सर्वहेतुश्च प्राणायाम इति स्थितः॥'

2385. तत्समं च द्वयोरैक्यं जीवात्मपरमात्मनोः। प्रनष्टसर्वसंकल्पः समाधिः सोऽभिधीयते॥ ह. यो. प्र. IV. 7. This is practically the same as स्कन्द, काशी॰ 47. 127 यत्समत्वं द्वयोरत्र ... भिधीयते॥

2386. तत्र शब्दार्थज्ञानविकल्पैः संकीर्णा सवितर्का समापत्तिः। स्मृतिपरिशुद्धौ स्वरूपशून्येवार्थमात्रनिर्भासा निर्वितर्का। एतयैव च सविचारा निर्विचारा च सूक्ष्मविषया व्याख्याता।... ता एव सबीजः समाधिः। यो. सू. I. 42–44, 46; तद्यथा गौरिति शब्दो गौरित्यर्थो गौरिति ज्ञानमित्यविभागेन विभक्तानामपि ग्रहणं दृष्टम्। विभाज्यमानाश्चान्ये शब्दधर्मा अन्येऽर्थधर्मा अन्ये विज्ञानधर्मा इत्येषां विभक्तः पन्थाः। भाष्य.

samādhi, viz. savitarka, nirvitarka, savicāra, nirvicāra. Vide p. 1411 note 2318 above. The word gauḥ, the object cow denoted by it and the concept or idea (jñāna) 'this is a cow' are all really three separate matters, but they are apprehended as mixed up. When a yogin concentrates upon a gross object and his intellect is conscious of that object as permeated by all the above three, then that samādhi is savitarka (Y. S. I. 42). For the others vide note 2318 and below. In the asamprajñāta Samādhi, the ultimate reality dawns on the yogin, prakṛti does not affect him in any way, his soul which abides in itself and is not conscious of personality and even of joy is all *cit* or *citśakti* and nothing else. In this section about the influence of yoga on Dharmaśāstra it is not necessary to go deeply into the several stages of samādhi described in the yoga works. The Gorakṣaśataka [2387] describes the final stage of samādhi as follows: 'A yogin in Samādhi does not apprehend smell, flavour, form, touch or sound nor does he apprehend himself or others (as distinct); knowers of brahma hold it to be pure, immovable, eternal, not engaged in activities, free from the guṇas, expansive like the sky, as intelligence and bliss; the knower of yoga reaches non-duality in the highest stage as milk poured in milk, ghee into ghee or fire into fire.'

It would have been noted that in dhāraṇā, dhyāna and samādhi the principal emphasis is mental. External conditions do help in the training but they are subsidiary. As noted above (pp. 1421–22) cleanliness, contentment, austerities (tapas), sexual purity, certain easy postures and living in detachment, restrictions as to quantity and quality of food—these are the chief physical or external conditions. While the yogin practises the above three he may develop certain super-normal powers which he is advised to ignore, as they are hindrances in the attainment of his goal (Yogasūtra III. 36). Though this is the opinion of Patañjali, from the fact that with most yogins the siddhis are an important part of yoga doctrines and the fact that, out of 195 sūtras of the Yogasūtra, 35 (III. 16–50) are devoted

---

2387. न गन्धं न रसं न रूपं न स्पर्शं न च निःस्वनम्। आत्मानं न परं वेत्ति योगी युक्तः समाधिना॥ निर्मलं निश्चलं नित्यं निष्क्रियं निर्गुणं महत्। व्योम विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म ब्रह्मविदो विदुः॥ दुग्धे क्षीरं घृते सर्पिरग्नौ वह्निरिवार्पितः। अद्वयत्वं व्रजेन्नित्यं योगवित्परमे पदे॥ गोरक्षशतक verses 97, 99–100. The first verse is also ह. यो. प्र. IV. 108. Compare श्वेता. उप. VI. 19 निष्कलं निष्क्रियं, कठोप. 3. 15 अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं, विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म बृह. उप. III. 9. 28 and श्वेताश्व. उप. I. 15 तिलेषु तैलं ... चाग्निः with दुग्धे क्षीरं &c.

to the description of siddhis, the present author is constrained to say that siddhis are an integral part of Yoga. The Vaikhānasa-smārtasūtra says that the yogin can vanish from people, can see distant objects and hear in spite of great distance.

It is unnecessary to dwell upon the results of all *saṁyamas* mentioned in Y. S. pāda three. A few are cited by way of sample. By saṁyama on the power of an elephant one secures the strength of an elephant (III. 24), by saṁyama on the sun there arises the knowledge of the seven worlds (III. 26) and by saṁyama on the moon, there arises knowledge of the arrangement of the stars (III. 27), by saṁyama on the navel *cakra* arises knowledge of the arrangement of the body (III. 29, viz. the three *doṣas*, *vāta*, *pitta*, *kapha* and the seven dhātus viz. skin, blood, flesh, sinews, bones, marrow and semen). By saṁyama on the coarse[2388] forms, the essential attributes (svarūpa), the subtle form (tanmātrās), the inherence (anvaya) and the purposiveness of the five elements results the conquest (or mastery over) elements and from this results the appearance of the perfections called *aṇimā* and others, perfection of body and non-obstruction (of the actions of the yogin by the qualities of the elements i. e. the earth cannot prevent the yogin by its hardness from penetrating inside the earth's rocks nor can fire burn him &c.). In IV. 1 Patañjali states that supernormal powers (siddhis) arise in five ways viz. by birth in certain[2389] bodies

---

2388. स्थूलस्वरूपसूक्ष्मान्वयार्थवत्त्वसंयमाद्भूतजयः । ततोऽणिमादिप्रादुर्भावः कायसम्पत्तद्धर्मानभिघातश्च । रूपलावण्यबलवज्रसंहननत्वानि कायसम्पत् । योगसूत्र III. 44–46. स्वरूप consists of nature or attributes of the five elements and is explained as solidness (or hardness) of the earth, liquidity of water, heat of fire, mobility of the wind, all pervading nature of ākāśa. The 4th rūpa of the elements viz. *anvaya* is the attributes of *khyāti* (cognition), activity and inertia. भाष्य explains: अन्वयिनो गुणाः प्रकाशप्रवृत्तिस्थितिरूपतया सर्वत्रैवान्वयित्वेन समुपलभ्यन्ते. Vide यो. सू. II. 18 'प्रकाशक्रियास्थितिशीलं भूतेन्द्रियात्मकं भोगापवर्गार्थं दृश्यम् ।'. The three प्रका... स्थिति stand for guṇas सत्त्व, रजस्, तमस् respectively. Vide above p. 1357 note 2215 (सत्त्वं लघु etc.). The fifth 'arthavatva' consists in the five elements serving the purpose of affording experience and liberation to the soul. वज्रसंहननत्व having a body as hard as diamond. वज्रस्य इव संहननं संहतिः अस्य तस्य भावः वज्रसंहननत्वम्. The भाष्य explains तद्धर्मानभिघातश्च as पृथ्वी मूर्त्या न निरुणद्धि योगिनः शरीरादिक्रियां, शिलामप्यनुविशतीति । नापः स्निग्धाः क्लेदयन्ति । नाग्निरुष्णो दहति etc.

2389. जन्मौषधिमन्त्रतपःसमाधिजाः सिद्धयः । यो. सू. IV. 1. Ernest Wood on 'Yoga' (1959, in Penguin Books) observes on p. 104 about levitation (*laghimā*) 'I remember one occasion when an old yogin was levitated in a recumbent position about six feet above ground in an open field for about

(*Continued on next page*)

(e.g. being born as a bird which can fly high in the sky), by the use of certain drugs, by the *japa* of certain mantras, by *tapas* (which is one of the niyamas) and by samādhi, each succeeding one being superior to each preceding one.

The siddhis have been enumerated and explained above on pp. 1112–13. The Devaladharmasūtra has a long note on siddhis, which is quoted in Kalpataru (Mokṣakāṇḍa pp. 216-217).[2390] The Yājñavalkya smṛti (III. 202–203) enumerates some characteristic signs of Yogasiddhi, viz. becoming invisible to others, remembrance of incidents in past lives, charming appearance, ability to see past and future happenings or objects that are distant, knowing what is being said at a great distance, entering another body after leaving one's own body, creation of things at one's will (without possessing the appropriate materials).

A great deal has been said above on mantras under Tantra (pp. 1096–1107 and notes thereto). There are two theories about mantras; one is the vibration theory, viz. that the letters of the mantra are charged with certain powers by the original composer and user of it and when the mantra is repeated certain imperceptible vibrations are set up which help in securing the purpose for which the mantra is repeated. The other theory is that the mantra comes down from antiquity and from

---

(Continued from last page)

half an hour, while the visitors were permitted to pass sticks to and fro between'. He further refers to levitation which a princess of Sikkim asserted she saw as a girl. A. Koestler in 'The Lotus and the Robot' (London, 1960, on p. 114) doubts the quality of the evidence of E. Wood on the ground that no exact date or place is mentioned and asserts that no experiment on levitation with definite date and place has been published. But Dr. Alexander Cannon in 'The invisible influence' (1935) pp. 39–41 narrated a personal experience of lavitation (laghimā). It is not clear whether A. Koestler was aware of this statement.

2390. A short extract from the long prose passage of Devala-dharmasūtra may be set out here. तत्र देवलः । अणिमा महिमा लघिमा प्राप्तिः प्राकाम्यमीशित्वं वशित्वं यत्रकामावसायित्वं चाष्टावैश्वर्यगुणाः । तेषामणिमा महिमा लघिमा त्रयः शारीराः । प्राप्त्यादयः पञ्चेन्द्रियाः । ... शरीराशुगामित्वं लघिमा । तेनातिदूरस्थानपि क्षणेनासादयति । विश्वविषयावाप्तिः प्राप्तिः । प्राप्त्या सर्वप्रत्यक्षदर्शी भवति । ... अप्रतिहतैश्वर्यमीशित्वम् । ईशित्वेन दैवतान्यप्यतिशेते । ... यत्रकामावसायित्वं त्रिविधम्–छायावेशः, अवध्यानावेशः, अङ्गप्रवेश इति । यत् परस्य अङ्गप्रवेशमात्रेण चित्तं वशीकरोति स छायावेशः । यद्दूरस्थानामपि अनुध्यानेन चित्ताधिष्ठानं सोऽवध्यानावेशः । यत्सजीवस्योभिस्ते (?) जीवस्य वा शरीरानुप्रवेशनं सोऽङ्गप्रवेशः । अन्तर्धानं स्मृतिः कान्तिर्दृष्टिः श्रोत्रज्ञता तथा । निजं शरीरमुत्सृज्य परकायप्रवेशनम् । अर्थानां छन्दतः सृष्टिर्योगसिद्धेश्च लक्षणम् । या. III. 202–203.

a great sage and its power of suggestion is great. But the real effective power of a mantra seems to the present au thor to depend far more on the knowledge, the responsiveness and the high spiritual level which the person who repeats it brings to bear on its use. No scientific tests have been employed and different works emphasize with exaggeration one of the two theories about mantras. All is speculation. The present author believes that the 2nd theory has greater elements of trust-worthiness than the first, as it relies on human psychology, while the first degenerated so much that the famous mantra 'om maṇi padme hūm' (dedicated to Avalokiteśvara) written on some material and pasted on a wheel which was turned round and round hundreds of times was supposed to yield great results. The 2nd theory led to the importance of *guru* and dīkṣā (initiation) and here also extravagant claims were made. This latter theory, however, required that the disciple should possess certain qualifications such as implicit faith in the guru, respect for matters spiritual, some knowledge of the tenets and the basic scriptures and readiness to devote time and energy to the study and practice of the teachings of the guru. Vide Śiva-saṁhitā (III. 10–19) for the relation between guru and disciple.

The fourth *pāda* deals with *Kaivalya.* The yogin who has gone through the whole discipline up to samādhi and has become thoroughly aware of the distinction between Puruṣa and the guṇas (*sattva* and others), becomes free from the influence of the three guṇas, because they merge in *Pradhāna* after having served the purpose of the soul, that is Kaivalya (isolation) or it (Kaivalya) may be stated to be the principle of consciousness that abides by itself (and does not become connected with even *sattva-guṇa*).[2391] This has also been alluded to in Y. S. II. 25 that states that when *avidyā* (nescience) is removed by discrimination the self (who is the perceiver) does not come into contact with the guṇas, which state is Kaivalya.[2392] Kaivalya

---

2391. पुरुषार्थशून्यानां गुणानां प्रतिप्रसवः कैवल्यं स्वरूपप्रतिष्ठा वा चितिशक्तिरिति। यो. सू IV. 34; भाष्य 'कृतभोगापवर्गाणां पुरुषार्थशून्यानां यः प्रतिप्रसवः कार्यकारणात्मकानां गुणानां तत्कैवल्यं, स्वरूपप्रतिष्ठा पुनर्बुद्धिसत्त्वानभिसम्बन्धात्पुरुषस्य चितिशक्तिरेव केवला, तस्याः सदा तथैवावस्थानं कैवल्यमिति'. वाचस्पति explains प्रतिप्रसवः as स्वकारणे प्रधाने लयः.

2392. तस्य हेतुरविद्या। तदभावात्संयोगाभावो हानं तद्दृशेः कैवल्यम्। यो. सू. II. 24–25; । तस्यादर्शनस्याभावाद् बुद्धिपुरुषसंयोगाभाव आत्यन्तिको बन्धनोपरम इत्यर्थः। एतद्धानम्। तद्दृशेः पुरुषस्यामिश्रीभावः पुनरसंयोगो गुणैरित्यर्थः। दुःखकारणनिवृत्तौ दुःखोपरमो हानं तदा स्वरूपप्रतिष्ठः पुरुष इत्युक्तम्। भाष्य. कैवल्य means 'एकाकिता' remaining alone by itself.

is put forword in IV. 34 from two points of view. When a puruṣa ceases to be affected in any way by the guṇas (that constitute prakṛti) because he has become entirely passionless, prakṛti becomes aloof (*kevala*) so far as that puruṣa is concerned. When puruṣa has thorough knowledge and ceases to be affected by guṇas he remains as bare consciousness (citiśakti) and remains aloof (kevala) and that is the 2nd point of view about *kaivalya*. In that state of kaivalya or mokṣa we cannot predicate any happiness or bliss about him but we can only say about him that he is in a state of bare consciousness (citiśakti). The Upaniṣads declare[2393] that in such a state the liberated soul has neither joy nor sorrow, that happiness or its opposite does not touch such an one, since he has risen above identifying the body with himself. The ideal of Yoga is to be jīvan-mukta (i. e. to reject Life and Personality, to die to this world though the body may persist for some time).

The eight aṅgas of Yoga are described in more or less detail in several Purāṇas. Vide Agni, chap. 214–215 and 372–76, Bhāgavata III. 28, Kūrma II. 11, Narasiṁha 61 (verses 3–13 of which are quoted by Kalpataru, mokṣakāṇḍa pp. 194–195), Matsya chap. 52, Mārkaṇḍeya (chap. 36–40 of Veṅk. edition, 39–43 of Cal. ed.) about 250 verses, many of which are quoted by Kṛtyakalpataru (on Mokṣa), Aparārka and others; Liṅga I. 8., Vāyu, chap. 10–15, Viṣṇu VI. 7 (which closely follows the Y. S, in thought and phraseology), Viṣṇudharmottara III. 280–284, Skanda (Kāśīkhaṇḍa, chap. 41).

Geraldine Coster in 'Yoga and Western Psychology' (Oxford Uni. Press, 1934) observes 'I am convinced that the ideas on which Yoga is based are universally true for mankind and that we have in the Yoga-sūtras a body of material which we could investigate and use with infinite advantage (p. 244)... My plea is then that Yoga as followed in the East is a practical method of mind development, quite as practical as analytical therapy and far more practical and closely related to real life than the average university course. I am convinced that the Yogasūtras of Patañjali do really contain the information[2393] that some of the most advanced psychotherapists of the present day are ardently seeking' (p. 245).

2393. अशरीरं वाव सन्तं न प्रियाप्रिये स्पृशतः । छा. उप. VIII. 12. 1; अध्यात्मयोगाधिगमेन देवं मत्वा धीरो हर्षशोकौ जहाति । कठ. II. 12. बे. सू. IV. 4. 2 (मुक्तः प्रतिज्ञानात्) is based on छा. उप. VIII. 12. 1.

The last chapter in Dr. Behanan's book on 'Yoga, a scientific evaluation' is interesting and important. He makes an appraisal of several aspects of Yoga by means of experiments which he carried out on himself after spending one year under the guidance of Swami Kuvalayānand of Lonavla and after he had three years of experience in Yogic breathing. It is not possible for reasons of space to give here a summary of his appraisal of several aspects of Yoga but reference may be made to a few of his findings. He finds that by yogic practices the mind is turned inward and detached from the external world (p. 232), it seems to him very probable that the prāṇāyāmic breathing induces a state of relaxation, thereby inducing the mind to take an inward course (p. 234), that taking normal breathing as a basis of comparison it was found that oxygen consumption increased 24. 5 per cent in Ujjāyī, 18. 5 per cent in *bhastrikā* and 12 per cent in Kapālabhāti; that the nasal gaze in a meditative posture is an aid to checking the wandering propensities of the mind (p. 242), that Yogic practices lead to an emotional stability and that watching at close range for a year the daily lives of more than half a dozen practitioners of yoga Dr. Behanan concluded that they were the happiest personalities that he had known and that their serenity was contagious (p. 245).

Dr. P. A. Sorokin of the Harvard University, one of the greatest living sociologists, contributes a very valuable paper on 'Yoga and man's transfiguration' to the Bhāratiya Vidyā Bhavan's Journal for November 1958 (pp. 111–120), the very first sentence of which opens with the words 'The methods and techniques of the yoga, particularly those of the Rājayoga, contain in themselves nearly all the sound techniques of modern psycho-analysis, psychotherapy, psycho-drama, moral education, and education of character.'

That a person engaged in Yoga practices is succeeding in reaching higher and higher spiritual levels is shown by the appearance of certain traits in himself. The Śv. Up. states that the first favourable signs of the working of Yoga are: lightness or agility of body, health, freedom from desires, brightness of complexion, fineness of voice, pleasant bodily odour, passing only a small quantity of urine or excreta. Almost the same verse occurs in the Vāyu [2394] and the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas and

2394. लघुत्वमारोग्यमलोलुपत्वं वर्णप्रसादः स्वरसौष्ठवं च । गन्धः शुभो मूत्रपुरीषमल्पं योगप्रवृत्तिं प्रथमां वदन्ति ॥ श्वेता. उप. II. 11; वायु. 11. 63 reads सत्त्वं तथारोग्य ...

(*Continued on next page*)

Mārkaṇḍeya further says 'people come' to like the yogin and sing praises of his qualities behind his back and all animals are not afraid of him; he is not affected by severe cold or heat and is not afraid of others; these show that *siddhi* in Yoga is approaching.' The Vāyupurāṇa adds 'if the practitioner of Yoga sees the earth or his body as if on fire and if he sees himself entering the elements (or all beings) he should understand that success in Yoga is near.' [2395]

The Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa (chap. 38 verse 26) and the Viṣṇupurāṇa II. 13 describe at some length *yogicaryā* (i. e. behaviour or conduct of a yogin). It is not possible to set out all that is said in these chapters but two striking verses are rendered here. The Mārkaṇḍeya [2396] says 'honour and disrespect cause pleasure and distress to man (in general), but these two have the reverse effect and serve to produce perfection in the yogin; these two are called poison and nectar respectively; disrespect is nectar for the yogin and honour is terrible poison.' The Viṣṇupurāṇa emphasizes that a yogin should so act that people will disrespect him and would not seek his company. The Manusmṛti (in VI. 38–85) enlarges upon the duties of sannyāsins, many of which are applicable to yogins. In VI. 65 Manu calls upon the sannyāsin to ponder by means of Yoga over the subtleness of the Highest Self and in VI. 73 Manu advises the ascetic to practise dhyānayoga. The Yājñavalkyasmṛti also (in III. 56–67) prescribes the duties of sannyāsins, one of which (in verse 64) is the same as Manu VI. 73.

The Śāntiparva provides [2397] that a man is said to be a yogin by those who know the procedure and ordinances of Yoga,

---

(Continued from last page)

वर्णप्रभा सुस्वरसौम्यता च गन्ध ... योगप्रवृत्तिः प्रथमा शरीरे ॥. The मार्कण्डेय reads अलौल्यमारोग्यमनिष्ठुरत्वं गन्धः ... ल्पम् । कान्तिः प्रसादः स्वरसौम्यता च योगप्रवृत्तेः प्रथमं हि चिह्नम् ॥ 36. 63 (= 39. 63 in Cal. ed.). This and two more verses of Mārkaṇḍeya (*36. 64–65*) are q. by कृत्यकल्प॰ (on मोक्ष) p. 211.

2395. आत्मानं पृथिवीं चैव ज्वलन्तीं यदि पश्यति । भूतान्याविशते चैव विद्यात्सिद्धिमुपस्थिताम् ॥ वायु 11. 64 q. by कृत्यकल्प॰ (on मोक्ष) p. 211.

2396. मानापमानौ यावेतौ प्रीत्युद्वेगकरौ नृणाम् । तावेव विपरीतार्थौ योगिनः सिद्धिकारकौ ॥ मानापमानौ यावेतौ तावेवाहुर्विषामृते । अपमानोऽमृतं तत्र सम्मानस्तु विषं विषम् ॥ मार्क. 38. 2–3; compare विष्णुपुराण II. 13. 42–43 संमानना परां हानिं योगर्द्धेः कुरुते quoted in note 2284 above.

2397. स्थिरीकृत्येन्द्रियग्रामं मनसा मिथिलेश्वर । मनो बुद्ध्या स्थिरं कृत्वा पाषाण इव निश्चलः ॥ स्थाणुवच्चाप्यकम्पः स्याद्गिरिवच्चापि निश्चलः । बुद्ध्वा विधिविधानज्ञास्तदा युक्त

(Continued on next page)

when he curbs the senses by his mind and makes the mind itself firm by his intellect and he becomes unmoved (by objects of sense) as if he were a stone, is unshakable like a tree-trunk, strong and motionless like a mountain. The wise call a man yukta (a yogin), when he neither hears, nor smells fragrance, nor tastes nor sees, nor touches and when his mind does not form (ever changing) ideas, when he does not regard anything as his own, when he does not cognise (external objects) as if he were a log of wood and when he can be said to have recovered the original real nature (of the Self). The Devaladharmasūtra provides that all beings come under bondage owing to *ahaṅkāra* (egoism that one will do this or that) and *mamatva* (regarding transient things as owned by oneself) but he who is free from these becomes liberated.[2398]

Through centuries Sannyāsins and Yogins have been paid the highest honours in India. Special emphasis is laid on inviting a Yogin at a śrāddha and it is said by some authorities that a single yogin is equal to hundreds and thousands of brāhmaṇas. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. IV. pp. 388, 398–399 for original authorities. In cases of doubt as to what the proper conduct or Dharma is in a set of circumstances, the matter was left to be decided by a *pariṣad* (an assembly) of ten learned brāhmaṇas or at least three, but even one may constitute a pariṣad, provided he is learned in Veda and knows Dharma (vide Manu XII. 108–113). But Yāj. I. 9 and others say that four persons knowing the Veda and Dharmaśāstra or three of the same type or even one who is the best among knowers of spiritual matters (ascetics) may constitute a pariṣad and what he declares would be the right course of conduct. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. 969 for texts on this point. The Bhagavad-gītā says 'the yogin (who is a real karmayogin surrendering the

---

(Continued from last page)

प्रचक्षते । न शृणोति न चाघ्राति न रस्यति न पश्यति ॥ न च स्पर्शं विजानाति न सङ्कल्पयते मनः ॥ न चाभिमन्यते किञ्चिन्न बुध्यति च काष्ठवत् । तदा प्रकृतिमापन्नं युक्तमाहुर्मनीषिणः ॥ शान्तिपर्व । (cr. ed. 294. 14–17 = 306. 14–17 Ch. ed.) q. by कृत्यकल्पतरु (on मोक्ष pp. 187–188). The editor did not identify this passage. The गोरक्षशतक q. above in n. 2387 appears to be based on this passage of the शान्तिपर्व.

2398. इदं ममेति यस्त्वाप्यमात्मनोऽर्थेषु मन्यते । अजानंस्तदनित्यत्वं ममत्वमिति तद्विदुः ॥ अहमित्यभिमानेन यः क्रियासु प्रवर्तते । कार्यकारणयुक्तासु तदहङ्कारलक्षणम् । अहङ्कारममत्वाभ्यां बध्यन्ते सर्वदेहिनः । संसारविनियोगेषु ताभ्यां मुक्तस्य (मुक्तस्तु?) मुच्यते ॥ देवल q. by कल्पतरु (मोक्षप्रकरण pp. 90–91).

fruits of his actions to God) is superior to persons practising tapas (such as fasts or following Haṭhayoga) and superior even to those who have mastered philosophical knowledge (like that of Sāṅkhya) and he is superior to those who are performers of Vedic rites (leading to *svarga*); therefore, O Arjuna! be a yogin, that does acts (because it is his duty to do so and who does not hanker afer the fruits of those actions).

Manu (XII. 83) states 'study of the Veda, *tapas*, true knowledge (about brahma), restraint of the sense organs, *ahiṁsā*, attending on one's guru-these are the highest means of *niḥśreyasa* (i. e. mokṣa). Then verse 85 proceeds 'of all these six means true knowledge of the Self is the highest, it is at the head of all *vidyās* (lores), since immortality (mokṣa) is obtained by means of it.

The highest value is attached to Yoga [2399] as an integral part of Vedānta by the Yājñavalkyasmṛti when it states that realization of the Self by means of Yoga is the highest Dharma. Then the same Smṛti provides [2400] 'study of the Veda, performance of sacrifices, brahmacarya (sexual purity), *tapas* and *dama* (restraint of senses), faith, fasting and freedom from attachment to worldly objects; these are the causes of securing knowledge of the Ātman.' It should be noticed that some of these fall under *yama*, *niyama* and *pratyāhāra*. The Dakṣasmṛti avers 'even the country, where a yogin, who has profound knowledge of yoga and who is given to *dhyāna*, becomes holy; what need is there to say about his relatives (i. e. they will certainly be pure). [2401]

The Yogasūtras are difficult and do not give complete explanations of the several stages of Yogic practices. They are in the nature of brief notes or hints that are calculated to rouse the curiosity of the hearer or reader and induce him to go to a competent teacher and learn Yoga practices. A few examples may be cited. Y. S. II. 50 refers to three kinds of Prāṇāyāmas, and II. 51 mentions a fourth (bāhyābhyantaraviṣayākṣepī caturthaḥ). There is no further explanation of this 4th variety. In IV. 1 Patañjali lumps together siddhis arising from janma, oṣadhi, mantra, tapas and samādhi. There is a vast difference

2399. अयं तु परमो धर्मो यद् योगेनात्मदर्शनम्। याज्ञ. I. 8.

2400. वेदानुवचनं यज्ञो ब्रह्मचर्यं तपो दमः। श्रद्धोपवासः स्वातन्त्र्यमात्मनो ज्ञानहेतवः॥ याज्ञ. III. 193; compare बृह. उप. IV. 4. 22 q. in note 1464, p. 918 above.

2401. यस्मिन्देशे वसेद्योगी ध्यायी योगविचक्षणः। सोऽपि देशो भवेत्पूतः किं पुनस्तस्य बान्धवाः॥ दक्षस्मृति VII. 45.

between a siddhi due to a drug and siddhis due to samādhi. Patañjali says that *Om* is the symbol of Īśvara and that repetition thereof and reflection on its meaning is a means of attaining *ekāgratā*, but there is no explanation why Om is expressive of Īśvara nor is any reference made to the Upaniṣads &c. about the importance of *Om* or how japa is to be performed. This is probably due to the agelong tradition that spiritual knowledge should be kept secret, should not be taught to all and sundry, but only to a disciple possessing certain qualifications. Already on pp. 1071–72 notes 1733, 1734 it has been shown from a few Upaniṣad quotations how esoteric knowledge was imparted only by a guru to a disciple. In the dialogue of Yājñavalkya and Ārtabhāga (Bṛ. Up. III. 2. 13), when the latter asked, after saying 'after a man's death his speech enters fire, his breath enters into wind, his eye into the sun, his body into the earth' 'where does then the man remain?' Yājñavalkya replied take my hand, on this matter we two alone must come to some understanding, but not here in the midst of company.' Then the two went aside and conferred with one another. That shows that the knowledge about what happens after death was not held to be a matter proper for being discussed in an assembly of people. The Chāndogya Up. (III. 11. 5) states 'therefore a father may tell that doctrine of Brahma to his eldest son or to a worthy pupil but not to anyone else even if the latter gave him this earth girt by waters (seas) and full of wealth, for this doctrine is worth more than that'. The Bṛ. Up. VI. 3. 12 provides 'one should not speak of it (brahma doctrine) to one who is not his son or pupil'; vide Śv. Up. VI. 22, Maitrāyaṇī Up. VI. 29 for similar words. The Śāntiparva in a chapter dealing with spiritual knowledge provides that it should be imparted to one's dear son and an obedient disciple, but not to one whose mind is not quiescent nor controlled, nor one who is jealous or crooked or a backbiter or a logic-chopper.[2402] H. Y. P. states 'a Yogin desirous of attaining *siddhi* should keep the knowledge of Haṭha as highly secret; it becomes potent if kept secret, but becomes impotent if exposed to all; one should practise yoga alone in the way expounded by the guru'.[2403] This applied in ancient

2402. तदिदं नाप्रशान्ताय नादान्तायातपस्विने। नासूयकायानृजवे न चानिर्दिष्टकारिणे। न तर्कशास्त्रदग्धाय तथैव पिशुनाय च। शान्ति० 246. 16–18 (Cb. ed). The words असूयकायानृजवे seem to be an echo of the verse quoted in the निरुक्त II. 4 विद्या ह वै ... असूकायानृजने &c.

2403. हठविद्या परं गोप्या योगिना सिद्धिमिच्छता। भवेद्वीर्यवती गुप्ता निर्वीर्या तु प्रकाशिता॥ गुरूपदिष्टमार्गेण योगमेव समभ्यसेत्। ह. यो. प्र. I. 11 and 16.

times not only to esoteric knowledge but to other scholastic studies. The Nirukta (II. 3) says that it (Nirukta) should not be taught to one who does not know grammar, nor to one who does not approach (the guru) for knowledge or who is not aware of the importance of the śāstra, since an ignorant person always bears ill-will to knowledge; and the Nirukta quotes (II. 4) four verses (called Vidyāsūkta) on this matter.[2404] In the Bhagavadgītā Kṛṣṇa frequently emphasizes that the knowledge of Bhaktiyoga is a sovereign secret (IX. 2), in XVII. 63 the knowledge conveyed to Arjuna is stated to be more secret than all secrets and in XVIII. 64-65 Kṛṣṇa asks Arjuna to listen to the most secret words of his viz. 'fix they mind on Me, be my devotee, offer sacrifice to me, prostrate thyself before me; thou shalt come to me; I promise to thee truly as thou art dear to me'. This last is repeated from IX. 34. At the end of chap. XV it is said 'O blameless one! this most secret doctrine has been expounded by me to you'.

Whether the path of Yoga is desirable or feasible in its entirety cannot be debated here. But there have been great men in India for thousands of years who have trodden the path of Yoga that led to the desired goal of freedom of the self from *avidyā* and the bondage of birth and death by means of Yoga. Even as early as the Śāntiparva (chap. 289, cr. ed. verses 50 and 54), the path of yoga is said to be very difficult and that it is easy to stay on the sharp edges of razors, but that those whose souls are not purified would find it difficult and painful to continually practise Dhāraṇās. Kālidāsa so finely describes in the 8th canto of the Raghuvaṁśa (verses 16-24) how Yoga was practised by king Raghu. Kālidāsa refers (in VIII. 16) to *apavarga* as the goal of the ascetic Raghu as contrasted with *mahodaya* (*abhyudaya* or *bhoga*), both words occurring in Y. S. II. 18 (prakāśa ... ... bhogāpavargārtham dṛśyam); mentions dhāraṇā (in VIII. 18), praṇidhāna practice and consequent mastery over the five prāṇas (in Raghu VIII. 19, Y. S. II. 45 'samādhisiddhirīśvara-praṇidhānāt); mastery over the three guṇas that constitute prakṛti (Raghu VII. 21, Y. S. III. 48 mentions 'pradhānajaya), Yogavidhi as a means of *paramātmadarśana* (Raghu VIII. 22, Yāj. smṛti I. 8 quoted in note 2399).

2404. Vide the Gospel of Mark IV. 11 and 33-34 where Christ is said to have expounded all things to his twelve disciples, but only in parables to the multitude.

Rājayoga holds the supreme goal to be liberation from Nature (prakṛti) or Māyā of the Advaita) and its attitude towards the world of senses and our empirical life is that of shunning these. Mukti means absorption into *brahma* for the Vedantist or Kaivalya (isolation of the Individual self from the bonds of birth and death and from prakṛti according to pure Yoga). For the vast majority of men and women the path and final goal of Pātañjala Yoga or of the Advaita Vedānta are almost inaccessible and unattainable, as the Gītā itself states (XII. 5) "Those whose mind is set on the Unmanifested encounter greater difficulties (than those who worship a personal God), since the goal of the unmanifested is hard to reach by embodied beings'. The path of *Karmayoga* (performing good deeds and acts prescribed by Śāstra without hankering for rewards) and *Bhaktiyoga* (wherein there is deep devotion to God and self-surrender) appear to be more suitable and practical for ordinary human beings. The Gītā in chap. XIII. (verses 13-17) contains one of the best descriptions of God as transcendent and immanent and verse 18 adds that the devotee of God who understands this reaches God.

Many readers familiar with Shri Aurobindo's *āśrama* at Pondicherry and his voluminous writings might express surprise at the present author's non-mention (in what precedes) of Shri Aurobindo (who is called Mahāyogī by his disciples and admirers) in this section on Yoga and its influence on Dharmaśāstra. But the reasons are obvious. In the first place, Shri Aurobindo says hardly anything about Dharmaśāstra in relation to Yoga. In the 2nd place, Shri Aurobindo admits that he had 'no touch from a guru', that he got an inner touch and practised Yoga, that he got some help from Mr. Lele of Gwalior, that when he came to Pondicherry he got from within a programme for his *sādhanā*, that he could not make much progress as to the help to be given to others and that when the Mother (Mira Richard) came to the *āśrama* in 1920 he found with her aid the method of helping others. In the next place, he departs from the teachings of a galaxy of Sanskrit writers on Yoga, viz. that a yogin must shun women (vide p. 1421 and note 2330), while his biographer Mr. Diwakar states that the Aurobindo Ashram was founded on 24th November 1926, that the Mother was entirely in charge of it from that day and that Shri Aurobindo thenceforward cut off all contacts except through the Mother (p. 257). In this, he strikes an entirely new line and appears to ordinary

men like the present author to have diverged far from the well trodden path of ancient Yoga and become like one described in the well-known words ('Murārestṛtīyaḥ panthāḥ'). Shri Aurobindo is a mystic,[2405] the experiences of mystics are peculiar and their own, ordinary words and modes of speech fail to communicate them to those that cannot claim to have ever shared such experiences. Aurobindo became a recluse from November 1926 to his Mahāsamādhi on 5th December 1950 and gave *darśana*[2406] only on four days in the year viz. 15th August (his birth date), 24th November (day of victory for him), 21st February (the birth date of the Mother) and 24th April the day of the Mother's coming to the Ashrama (vide Mr. Diwakar's 'life of Mahāyogī' p. 265). For forty years Aurobindo lived in Pondicherry. His Ashram became a centre of the gospel of integrated Yoga and a home for those who sought real life and light, a place of pilgrimage for men and women attracted by his teachings.

On 15th August 1947 when India attained Independence (which happened to be the date of Aurobindo's birth) he issued a long statement referring to the dreams of his youth, which he thought were arriving at fruition or were on their way to achievement. He stated 'the first of these dreams was a revolutionary movement which would create a free and united India. Another dream was the resurgence and liberation of the peoples of Asia and her return to her great role in the progress of human civilization. The third dream was a world union forming the outer basis of a fairer, brighter and nobler life for all mankind. A catastrophe may intervene and interrupt or destroy what is being done; but even then the final result is sure. For unifica-

2405. It is difficult to give an accurate definition of 'mysticism'. W. R. Inge in his work 'Christian Mysticism' publishes 26 definitions of the word in an Appendix. James H. Leuba defines it as follows: "Mysticism means for us any experience taken by the experiencer to be a contact (not through the senses, but immediate or intuitive) or union of the self with a larger than self, be it called the World Spirit, God, the Absolute or otherwise" ('Psychology of religious mysticism,' Kegan Paul, 1929). In a recent work 'Mysticism, sacred and profane' Prof. R. C. Zaehner (Oxford, 1957) says 'Mysticism is the realization of unity' (p. 144) and translates and examines Chān. Up. VI. 9.1–4, Bṛ. Up.II. 3–6, III. 7.I. ff. Bhagavadgītā II. 55–72 (pp. 136–145) for that purpose.

2406. Vincent Sheean in his work 'Lead, kindly light' (Random House, New, York, 1949) pp. 269–277 has a very illuminating and sympathetic note on what 'obtaining darshan' of such Great Men as Mahatma Gandhi and Shri Aurobindo means to the crowds that throng for it.

tion is a necessity of Nature, an inevitable movement. Another dream, the spiritual gift of India to the world, has already begun; India's spirituality is entering Europe and America in an ever-increasing measure. The final dream was a step in evolution which would raise man to a higher and larger consciousness and begin the solution of the problems which have perplexed and vexed him since he began to think and to dream of individual perfection and a perfect society. Here too, if the evolution is to take place, since it must proceed through a growth of the spirit and the inner consciousness, the initiative can come from India and, although the scope must be universal, the central movement may be hers'.

These emotional and eloquent words are flattering to the pride of all Indian people, but it is possible that, bearing in mind that the whole of India was mostly under the heel of ruthless or exploiting conquerors for over seven hundred years from the 13th century A. D. (except for some parts and for brief periods as under the Vijayanagar Empire or under the Marathas for about 150 years and for about 50 years under Maharaja Ranjit Singh in Panjab) these proud assertions of Aurobindo are likely to bring derisive smiles on the faces of many non-Indian readers. It is for discerning Indian readers to judge whether any of the dreams of Shri Aurobindo (except the first about[2407] Independence) are on the way to achievement or realization, whether during the last fourteen years after Independence India has progressed in the way of spirituality among men in general, whether there is any likelihood of there being a union of peoples and nations in the near future or whether the world is on the brink of a precipice.

Shri Aurobindo had set his heart on the unity of the human race by an inner oneness and purpose and not by an external association of interests; for 24 years he completely withdrew from the outer world and gave *darśana* only on four days in the year. What efforts he made for the inner oneness of the human race except by his writings is not clear and nor does it appear that in the community of men and women that gathered under his leadership and influence at Pondicherry any one occupied

2407. There has been no 'United India' after Independence. The country was partitioned and Pakistan came into being as a separate entity and has been a source of constant irritation to India, in spite of the policy of the appeasement of Pakistan followed by Indian leaders throughout. 'There is today hardly a Hindu or a Sikh to be found in West Pakistan' says Mr. V. P. Menon in 'Transfer of Power in India' on p. 43.

a pre-eminent position and energetically and fruitfully pursued the path marked by the Master and carries on the work that the master dreamt of and left unattempted and unfinished. Passages quoted from his letters by Shri Diwakar (on p. 258) clarify what visions he had 'there will be first a race representing the supermind as man represents the mind', 'in what I am trying to do the spiritual realization is the first necessity, but it cannot be complete without an outer realisation also in life, in men in this world, spiritual consciousness within but also spiritual life without'. About his Sādhanā he says 'I began my Yoga in 1904. My Sādhanā was not founded upon books but upon personal experiences that crowded on me from within......It is a fact that I was hearing constantly the voice of Vivekananda speaking to me for a fortnight in the Jail' (p. 131 of Mr. Diwakar's book).

In a letter to his brother Barindra dated 7th April 1920 which is set out in full on pp. 309–314 in the work 'Shri Aurobindo on himself and on the Mother' (1953), Aurobindo asserts 'the main defect in the old Yogas consisted in the fact that they knew mind and intelligence and the Ātman; they used to be satisfied with spiritual experience on the mental level; but the mind is capable of only partial knowledge and it can comprehend only parts and not the whole. The mind can know the infinite and the total reality only through Samadhi, Moksha or Nirvana and by no other means. Of course, some people do attain this kind of Moksha which may be said to be a blind alley. But *then what is the use of it?* But what the Bhagwan intends to do with man is to enable him to realize God in life, in the individual as well as in the collective society (to manifest God in life). The old systems of Yoga could not bring about a synthesis or unity between spirituality and life; they disposed of the world calling it Māyā or the transitory play of the Lord. The result is vitality and vigour in life have been sapped and India has decayed'. In this passage Aurobindo tries to bring out the distinction between his integral Yoga and the Yoga of ancient and medieval Indians. There is hardly anything very new in his theory of Yoga. The Gītā also says the same in 'ajñānenāvṛtam' (Gītā V. 15), in 'utsīdeyur-ime lokā' (Gītā III. 24–25, II. 47, III. 8, 19, IX. 27, XVIII. 45–46, all of which emphasize that disinterested work is worship of God). Aurobindo should have brought into being an organised body of workers after his own heart. The Pātañjala Yoga does not employ the

word Māyā at all nor did it say that the world was a play of God. It was the Vedānta-sūtra II. 1. 33 (lokavat-tu līlākaivalyam) that said so by way of repelling an objection. In the Pātañjala yoga Īśvara has nothing to do with the creation of the world (vide above pp. 1402–3) but it speaks of *avidyā* by which the individual self is enmeshed (Y. S. II. 3–5 and 24) and not God or the Supreme Self. Besides one is tempted to echo the question of Aurobindo himself 'What is the use of integral Yoga, mind, overmind and supermind?' Can anybody point out even half a dozen men and disciples of Aurobindo who have devoted all their energies to the regeneration of the country and of the human race on his lines? The position of the Ashram itself is rather vague, anomalous and undefined. But it is unnecessary to say in this work anything further about it. [2408]

The writings of Shri Aurobindo are numerous and voluminous. For a list of his writings along with a few other works, vide the Bibliography (pp. 267–269) given by Shri Diwakar at the end of his work 'Mahāyogī'. The present author has read only the following works of Shri Aurobindo 'Yoga and its objects' (1938, a brief work in which 'adhyātma Yoga' is said to be higher than Haṭhayoga and Rājayoga); 'The Mother' (1937), 'Essays on the Gītā (5th ed. of 1949), 'The Synthesis of Yoga' (1948) which attempts to show that all three paths, viz. of knowledge (Jñānayoga), of Devotion (Bhaktiyoga) and of Divine works (Karmayoga) can be integrated; 'the problem of Rebirth' (published by the Aurobindo Ashram in 1952 after his passing away); 'Foundations of Indian culture' (essays brought together in one volume, revised by Shri Aurobindo), New York, 1953; Aurobindo's *Magnum Opus* is 'Life Divine' (originally in three volumes, now available in one of 1272 pages, published by the Aurobindo International University Centre, Pondicherry 1955). The present author has read only the first volume of this last work. Men of ordinary intelligence like the present writer find this philosophical work not easy to read, and are often at a loss to find out, in the flood of high sounding phrases used by Shri Aurobindo concerning the mind, overmind,

2408. I have to acknowledge my obligations to two biographies of Sri Aurobindo, one by G. H. Langley (former Vice-Chancellor of Dacca University) published in 1949 and 'Mahāyogī' (on the life, Sādhanā and teachings of Aurobindo) written by Shri R. R. Diwakar and published by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan in Bombay, 1953. There is an interesting work published by the Aurobindo International University Centre at Pondicherry called 'Sri Aurobindo on himself and on the Mother' (1953)

supermind, his precise meaning. Only one sentence is cited here for sample (from p. 345 of the big one volume edition); 'Overmind, intuition, even supermind not only must be principles inherent and involved in the Inconscience from which we arise in the evolution and inevitably destined to evolve, but are secretly present, occult actively with flashes of intuitive emergence in the cosmic activity of mind, life and matter.' The present author regards the book 'Foundations of Indian culture' as the best of the works of Shri Aurobindo which he has read. Prof. R. D. Ranade in his Lectures on 'Bhagavadgītā as a philosophy of God Realization' (Nagpur, 1959 pp. 163–176) submits to examination Aurobindo's 'Essays on the Gītā' and disagrees with him on some points. While these pages were passing through the press the present writer received a copy of 'Integral Philosophy of Aurobindo', a symposium edited by Dr. Haridas Chaudhuri and Dr. Frederic Spiegelberg (and published by Allen and Unwin, 1960), which contains 30 papers written by Indian and Western scholars on the Philosophy of Aurobindo, p. 32 defining the essence of integral Yoga and p. 44 distinguishes between 'mind' and 'supermind' (of Aurobindo's philosophy).

CHAPTER XXXIII

Tarka and Dharmaśāstra

The Yājñavalkyasmṛti (I. 3) mentions Nyāya (logic)[2409] as one of the fourteen vidyās and as one of the means of knowing what Dharma is. Nyāya is rendered as 'tarkavidyā' by the Mitākṣarā on Yāj. and the Mit. states that the fourteen vidyās are the *hetu* (means) of (knowing) dharma.

Both the Nyāyasūtra and the Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda postulate that 'niḥśreyasa' follows from the correct knowledge of the categories of the two darśanas.[2410]

One of the earliest occurrences of the word *tarka* is in the Kaṭhopaniṣad[2411] where it is declared 'This knowledge (about the Self) cannot be obtained by (mere) ratiocination' and the previous verse states that the Self is subtler than the subtlest and not capable of being understood by mere inference or reasoning. The word 'mantavyaḥ' in the passage[2412] 'Ātmā vā are draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo' (in Bṛ. Up. II. 4. 5 and IV. 5. 6) is held by the objector (in bhāṣya on V. S. I. 1. 2) and also by Śaṅkarācārya as referring to *tarka* on V. S. II. 1. 4. Tarka is accepted as an aṅga of Yoga in the Maitrāyaṇī Up. (vide note 2327 above), which further quotes a passage stating that by the control of speech, mind and prāṇa one apprehends *brahman*

2409. Some works read the verse as 'Purāṇa-tarka-mīmāṁsā'; vide note 1337 for the verse.

2410. अथातो धर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः। यतोऽभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससिद्धिः स धर्मः। द्रव्यगुणकर्मसामान्यविशेषसमवायानां पदार्थानां साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां तत्त्वज्ञानं निःश्रेयसहेतुः। वैशेषिकसूत्र I. 1. 2 and 4; प्रमाणप्रमेयसंशयप्रयोजन-दृष्टान्त-सिद्धान्तावयवतर्क-निर्णयवादजल्पवितण्डाहेत्वाभासच्छलजातिनिग्रहस्थानानां तत्त्वज्ञानान्निःश्रेयसाधिगमः। न्यायसूत्र I. 1. 1. The word निःश्रेयस occurs in 'अचतुर०' (a long sūtra) in पा. and in कौषीतक्युपनिषद् II. 14 and III. 2.

2411. नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ठ। कठोप. II. 9 q. by शङ्कराचार्य in भाष्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 6. The previous verse ends with the words 'अणीयान्ह्यतर्क्यमणुप्रमाणात्.' आपनेय is an irregular form for आपनीय। (आप्+अनीय) *or for* अपनेय (*from* नी *with* अप).

2412. अथान्यत्राप्युक्तम्। अतः पराऽस्य धारणा तालुरसनाग्रनिपीडनाद्वाङ्मनःप्राणनिरोधनाद् ब्रह्म तर्केण पश्यति। मैत्रा. उप. VI. 20.

with the help of tarka.[2413] The Gautamadharmasūtra[2414] remarks 'tarka is the means for securing justice (among contending parties)'. One of the replies given by Yudhiṣṭhira to the Yakṣa guarding a lake is 'ratiocination is unstable (leads to no certain conclusions), the Vedic texts differ (among themselves), there is no single sage whose opinion is held authoritative (by people or other sages); the essence of Dharma is placed in a cave (i. e. is enveloped in darkness and cannot be seen clearly), that is the path (to be followed) by which the majority of people[2415] proceed'. This appears to make man in the mass the ultimate tribunal on all questions of value. In its peroration at the end, the Manusmṛti observes 'one who desires to secure the pure Dharma must know well the three viz. direct perception (or experience), inference, and śāstra based on various traditions; none but that man who considers the sayings of sages (i. e. the Veda), the instruction on Dharma (contained in the Smṛtis) with the help of reasoning that does not (directly) conflict with Veda and śāstras knows what Dharma is'.[2416] This is the position of most orthodox Sanskrit writers about Tarka. Their reasoning appears to have been this. If one were to rely on mere reason, the result would be uncertainty and anarchy. Every theorist states that his system is based on reason; but the answers arrived at on the basis of reason as to questions of vital importance to ordinary men are bewilderingly different. Thinkers brought up in different environments and of different experiences have different logics and propound even different moral laws. Whom should an ordinary man follow? The Vedas and Smṛtis

---

2413. श्रुतिरपि 'श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यः' इति श्रवणव्यतिरेकेण मननं विदधती तर्कमप्यादर्तव्यं दर्शयति (this is पूर्वपक्ष in भाष्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 4); to this the भाष्य replies 'यदपि श्रवणव्यतिरेकेण मननं विदधच्छब्द एव तर्कमप्यादर्तव्यं दर्शयतीत्युक्तम्। नानेन मिषेण शुष्कतर्कस्यात्रात्मलाभः सम्भवति। श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाश्रीयते।'. The following sentence in the भाष्य cites three examples of inferences not opposed to *śruti*.

2414. न्यायाधिगमे तर्कोऽभ्युपायः। तेनाभ्यूह्य यथास्थानं गमयेत्। गौ. ध. सू. II. 23–24.

2415. तर्कोऽप्रतिष्ठः। ... पन्थाः। वनपर्व 313. 117 (Chitrashala ed. whole verse q. in n. 2072). Some mss read नैको मुनिर्यस्य. The sūtra तर्काप्रतिष्ठानादप्यन्यथानुमेयमिति चेदेवमप्यविमोक्षप्रसङ्गः (वे. सू. II. 1. 11) seems to echo the words of वनपर्व. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 860 n. 1667, where मेधातिथि on मनु. II. 1 refers to 'महा ... पन्थाः' as a न्याय.

2416. प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च शास्त्रं च विविधागमम्। त्रयं सुविदितं कार्यं धर्मशुद्धिमभीप्सता॥ आर्षं धर्मोपदेशं च वेदशास्त्राविरोधिना। यस्तर्केणानुसन्धत्ते स धर्मं वेद नेतरः॥ मनु XII. 105, 106, relied upon by शङ्कराचार्य in भाष्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 11.

embody the principles of conduct in all spheres of life arrived at by eminent and selfless sages during the course of thousands of years i. e. they embody the experiences and the reasonings of numerous wise men. Therefore, if a modern man says that reason leads him to hold opinions opposed to the Veda, most people are not prepared to accept a single man's opinion pitted against the views of numerous ancient sages. This point need not be elaborated further. On many important questions viz. whether there is God or a Supreme Intelligence guiding the universe, or whether there is an individual self, or what the future of a man when he dies is, the wisest among men have given widely differing answers.[2417] On such questions final answers acceptable to all or most people cannot be given by reason alone. Though the orthodox position is as stated above, it has been shown above (e. g. on pp. 1267–1269) how Vedic practices have been discarded by the weight of popular opinion from time to time. It is laid down by Smṛti writers themselves that blindly following the words of Śāstra would lead to loss of Dharma and that in case of conflict between two Smṛtis reasoning should be resorted to and popular opinions and practices should be considered. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 866–868 for this. The Mahābhārata enjoins [2418] 'one should not try to solve incomprehensible matters by ratiocination.' In the dialogue between the famished sage Viśvāmitra (who desired to eat the tail of a dog) and a cāṇḍāla the great Epic winds up by saying 'therefore a learned man whose soul is pure should act after relying on his intelligence in the matter of deciding what Dharma and adharma are'.[2419] It should not be supposed that Śaṅkarācārya and other great Indian writers wanted to throw reasoning overboard altogether. What they emphasized was that mere reasoning of one or more men should not as a rule be followed if the

---

2417. Pascal quoted in 'This I believe' edited by E. P. Morgan (London, 1953) on p. 60 says 'The heart has its reasons which reason does not understand.'

2418. अचिन्त्याः खलु ये भावा न तांस्तर्केण योजयेत् । प्रकृतिभ्यः परं यच्च तदचिन्त्यस्य लक्षणम् । भीष्मपर्व 5. 12, q. by शङ्कराचार्य as स्मृति on वे. सू. II. 1.6. First half only q. by शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 6. This also occurs in मत्स्य 113. 6, पद्म (आदि 3. 12), the first half in ब्रह्माण्ड II. 13. 7–8. ब्रह्माण्ड reads तदचिन्त्यं प्रचक्षते and some read साधयेत् for योजयेत्. प्रकृति would mean material cause. The मत्स्य (Anan. ed.) reads अचिन्त्याः ... तांस्तु तर्केण साधयेत्, thus reversing the position adopted by others.

2419. तस्मात्कौन्तेय विदुषा धर्माधर्मविनिश्चये । बुद्धिमास्थाय लोकेऽस्मिन्वर्तितव्यं कृतात्मना ॥ शान्तिपर्व 141. 102 = cr. ed. chap. 139. 94.

conclusions arrived at by reasoning are in direct conflict with Vedic and smṛti texts. Śaṅkarācārya clearly states his position on V. S. II. 1. 1. and 11.[2420] Beliefs (such as those of Jaiṇs and Buddhists) were held to be heterodox, because they did not acknowledge the authority of the Veda and the sacred tradition, though they often observed Hindu practices and married with Hindus; but within this limit there was room enough for an enormous and bewildering variety of convictions, rites and practices that claimed to be orthodox. This may be illustrated by the attitude of some Upaniṣads. For example, the Muṇḍaka Up. (I. 1. 4–5) speaks of two vidyās, *parā* and *aparā*, includes under *aparā* the four Vedas and the six *aṅgas* and *parā* (highest) *vidyā* is that by which the imperishable *brahman* is attained. In the Chān. Up. (VII. 1. 1–5) when Nārada approached Sanatkumāra for instruction, the former recounted what he had already learnt viz. the four Vedas, Itihāsapurāṇa and other lores; then Sanatkumāra tells him that all that he has studied is mere name and then explains what is better than all those. Muṇḍaka (I. 2. 7) condemns *yajñas* as leaky vessels. It is extremely surprising that the Chān. Up. in I. 12. 2–5 compares the procedure of the five priests and the sacrificer touching each other and creeping from the *sadas* towards the cātvāla where the Bahiṣpavamāna chant is to be sung with a procession of dogs, each dog holding the tail of the preceding dog in his mouth. Vide for the creeping of priests noiselessly and silently Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa VI. 7. 9–12 and Āp. Śrauta-sūtra XII. 17. 1–4 and H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 1166 and 1169. Though this is so, the Upaniṣads are called Vedānta, are looked upon as orthodox and as the highest end of the Vedic religion and literature. Most ancient Upaniṣads, however, quote Vedic Saṁhitā texts as authorities. For example, Bṛ. Up. I. 4. 10 and Ait. Up. II. 5 quote Ṛg. IV. 26. 1 and IV. 27. 1 respectively; Bṛ. Up. II. 5. 16–17 quote Ṛg. I. 116. 12 and I. 117. 22 and Bṛ. Up. II. 5. 19 cites Ṛg. VI. 47. 18; Kaṭha IV. 9 is the same as Atharvaveda X. 8. 16, Praśna I. 11 is quoted from Ṛg. I. 164. 12. The Muṇḍaka III. 2. 10

2420. वेदस्य हि निरपेक्षं स्वार्थे प्रामाण्यं रवेरिव रूपविषये। पुरुषवचसां तु मूलान्तरापेक्षं वक्तृस्मृतिव्यवहितं चेति विप्रकर्षः। तस्माद्वेदविरुद्धे विषये स्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्गो न दोषः। भाष्य on वे. सू. II.1.1; तर्कज्ञानानां त्वन्योन्यविरोधात्प्रसिद्धा विप्रतिपत्तिः। यद्धि केनचित्तार्किकेणेदमेव सम्यग्ज्ञानमिति प्रतिपादितं तदपरेण व्युत्थाप्यते तेनापि प्रतिष्ठापितं ततोऽपरेण व्युत्थाप्यते इति प्रसिद्धं लोके। कथमेकरूपानवस्थितविषयं तर्कप्रभवं सम्यग्ज्ञानं भवेत्। न च प्रधानवादी तर्कविदामुत्तम इति सर्वैस्तार्किकैः परिगृहीतो येन तदीयं मतं सम्यग्ज्ञानमिति प्रतिपद्येमहि। शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. II. 1. 11.

provides that brahmavidyā is to be expounded to śrotriyas (those who have studied the Veda). Herein the Upaniṣads rely upon the principle of adhikārabheda.

One of the oldest philosophical problems is Authority and Reason or to put it in different words, Faith and Reason and there has been throughout the ages a constant struggle between these two. Most men want to rely on some authority, on some one deemed higher than themselves. For vast numbers of people this authority or the something greater than themselves is Revelation and God. They have neither the leisure nor the inclination nor the intellectual ability to think for themselves rationally on such abstruse questions as the existence of God or an individual self, free will and determinism, the general principles of conduct, the final destiny of men after physical death &c. In sociological matters human judgement is often warped by prevailing dogmas and prejudices; on questions which are deemed to be religious (and in India the field of matters deemed to be religious has always been very extensive) a frank discussion is almost impossible without creating anger and rancour. Several ethical questions such as divorce and birth control often assume the position of religious dogmas and when openly discussed create great heat. In several so-called democracies of the present day rational discussion comes last and vital questions are determined by party loyalties or by personality cults or by lust for power and self-aggrandisement. It should not be supposed that ancient and medieval India had no rationalists nor atheists. As a matter of fact there were several rationalists. Vide the present author's note 875 pp. 358-359 in H. of Dh. Vol. II, Vol. III. pp. 46-47 note 57 on Lokāyatas and their views, [2421] and pp. 974-975 note 1596 above for rationalistic criticism of sacrifices, śrāddhas &c. Many rationalists hold that there is no proof of the existence of God, they deny an individual soul, they deny immortality and the existence of any intelligence in the universe higher than man's, deny that there is any design or purpose in the Universe and they believe that in all religions there is some truth mixed with a great deal of error. The case of the rationalist is that

---

2421. For Lokāyata or Laukāyatika, vide the work Tattvopaplavasiṁha of Jayarāśibhaṭṭa (GOS). The word Lokāyata occurs in the *gaṇa* Ukthādi mentioned in Pāṇini 'Kratūkthādisūtrāntaṭ-ṭhak' IV. 2. 60. Vide Dr. Dakshinaranjan Shastri's 'Short History of Indian Materialism' (Calcutta, 2nd ed. of 1957) and pp. 1205-6 note 1956 above.

he should not be called upon to prove that there is no God (which is a negative proposition), that it is for theists to prove that God exists (which is a positive proposition) and that he is omnipotent and omniscient. They say that to attribute anger, love, pity to God is to implicitly negative God's omnipotence. The problem of evil in the world is, according to rationalists, a great stumbling block in accepting God as good, kind, all-knowing and all-powerful. The rationalist might agree with the theist that man as an individual depends on something greater than himself that is able to give directions and to punish him for the disobedience of directions. For the rationalist it is some kind of community or society in which men live and have their being that is greater than themselves. This would be substituting the worship of the human community or of collective human power for the worship of God. What human community is to be in the place of God? Is it to be the whole human race (now having over two thousand million human beings) or some big or small groups out of these? There are now two well-defined blocks between whom there is a conflict of ideological ends, viz. the communist block represented by the U. S. S. R. and China and the capitalistic block represented by U. S. A., England and several other countries of Europe, and a third unorganized block of countries professing to have no alignment with anyone of the two blocks.

In these days Communism is really a form of worship i. e. worship of man or men in place of the worship of God. It may be conceded that probably the masses of the Russian people are far better off in the matter of physical needs than they were in the regime of the Tsars. The masses seem to have devotion to Communism. But that devotion is more apparent than real, based on the hope of quick gains or the fear of prompt punishment and is the product of rigid State control of education and the environment. The communists have an attractive slogan in the words 'Workers of the world! unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains.' There are also the catchwords 'Dictatorship of the proletariat.'. But this ends in fact in a dictatorship of the Communist Party over the proletariat. In return for physical well-being the common people have had to bargain away several freedoms, freedom to think for themselves, freedom of expression, freedom of intercourse with foreigners, freedom to choose their occupation &c. The communists make no secret that they want to bring the whole world under Communism. Therefore, they pose that they are the

saviours of common men and women throughout the world and they cannot be charged with aggression since they mean to liberate people from the bonds of capitalism or colonialism &c. Their creed is one of fanaticism, of intolerance or hatred of others. The only experiment of a godless society on a large scale was made by the Soviet, but it does not appear to outsiders to have been a happy or successful one. The universal exhibition of portraits of great Soviet leaders (some of whom were declared by successor leaders to be no better than murderers)[2422] proclaims the necessity of worship even in a godless society. Dictators have nationalized not only all the means of the production of wealth but also all the *labour* in the country. They have established themselves in the place of God and desire to have total control over the bodies and the minds of all their subjects. The faith of the communists is that their country is a heaven on earth and one must accept their word for that without wanting to see for one self the real state of things. The Communists have their own special versions of history, economics and science. These one must not question.

The followers of Judaism, Christianity and Islam (all believing in one God and one Book) did not hesitate for centuries to inculcate their doctrines and practices by terrible persecutions and bloody wars. This spirit is very shocking to people brought up in Hinduism or Buddhism. If Rationalists substitute blocks of humanity or the leaders of such blocks for worship and authority, humanity itself would soon be wiped out. Conceding for argument that the existence of an omnipotent and omniscient Power cannot be proved to the satisfaction of the so-called rationalists, the present writer feels that it is for the good of most societies consisting of millions of common men and women that they believe in God and the individual soul. Most men are influenced to keep to the path of virtue and right by the fear of God, by the prickings of conscience (which is the inner light implanted in man by God), by the fear of public opinion, and by fear of punishment at the hands of the rulers of the State (vide

2422. Those interested in this phase of Communism should read 'Krushchev and Stalin's Ghost' by Bertram De Wolfe (1957); pp. 88–252 contain on even pages Krushchev's secret report to 20th Congress on the night of February 24, 25 in 1956, translated into English and odd pages contain notes and commentaries by the author. On p. 91 note it is stated that Stalin placed the number of *Kulaks* disposed of at one crore. Vide 'Assignment in Utopia' by E. Lyon (1937) for the horros in Russia before 1934, and 'Communist China to-day' by S. Chandrasekhara, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961 for the present state of morals in China.

Śāntiparva quoted in H. of Dh. vol. III. p. 389 note 619). Those who reject the first of these would have to reject the 2nd also and would have to fall back upon hedonism (the greatest pleasure for themselves) or the idea of greatest good of the greatest number or progress towards some ideal state of society painted by imagination. The pursuit of purely secular or worldly happiness is incompatible with the precepts and ideals of Hinduism and all higher religions. Rationalism accepts the postulates which science finds convenient and useful. Though these postulates work well up to certain limits, it must be said that those limits are very narrow. Science aims at establishing general rules or laws. From those laws we know only the behaviour of nature and how man can utilize natural forces for realizing human aims; but science does not tell us what those aims should be, it is amoral and not concerned with morals or spirituality. Rationalism appears to smother many experiences of the human mind which are beyond the present machinery of science. When the scientific method is adopted in social studies, there is little to show that it leads to increased wisdom about the values that should be pursued. Rationalism insists that all our beliefs ought ultimately to be based on tangible and definite grounds and that modern scientific method is the only reliable method for acquiring knowledge of all kinds. But there are sub-conscious and non-rational impulses, beliefs and intuitions in men that are held by men to be truer or of a higher order than what is on the rationalistic level (vide W. James' 'Varieties of religious experience' p. 74, ed. of 1920). It should be the endeavour of leaders of thought in each generation to find out what is essential and vital in tradition (without believing in the infallibility of all traditions) and to present reasoned dogmas which, while retaining the essential elements of tradition, will meet the demands of modern thought and conditions and environment. It is not necessary to say here more about modern rationalism. For over two thousand years our ancient writers and smṛtis like those of Manu (XII. 105-106 which are relied upon by Kumārila himself as shown on p. 1261 above) have allowed to *tarka* a place in the matter of finding out what Dharma is and have been most tolerant of differing views even on fundamental matters as shown above and brought about great changes even in religious rituals, philosophical views, social customs and practices without perpetrating atrocities and indulging in wholesale persecutions. A man may be a monotheist, or a polytheist or

an image-worshipper, an agnostci, or atheist or an idealist philosopher holding 'nirguṇa brahma' as the only reality, yet he may nevertheless be held to be a full Hindu, if he conforms to the general attitude towards Veda and social usages. A more radical tolerance than what our people showed throughout the ages is almost unthinkable. Western writers while admitting great tolerance in religious views and practices harp often on the requirements about observing caste rules in matters of food, marriage etc. But caste is more a social institution than a religious one and therefore just as in Western countries there were rules of etiquette and observance (such as the number 13 and the regulations against working on Sabbath and against theatre-going, card playing and physical exercise except walking) that had to be observed meticulously, in India caste rules had to be observed. Besides, even when caste rules were broken the offender had in a meeting of the caste people to admit his mistake, to pay a fine to the caste or village temple and then was restored to all privileges of the caste. As the Christian churches were extremely intolerant of the slightest departure from religious views held at particular times, there arose in Europe the emphasis on rationalism and freedom to hold opinions. Government could effectively mould the opinions of its subjects by controlling education, by censorship of books and by inflicting severe penalties on those who expressed opinions opposed to those espoused by them. The Roman Church prepared an Index of forbidden books and an Index expurgatorius (a list of passages to be expunged from books that were otherwise permitted). The first Index Librorum Prohibitorius in its latest edition (before 1949) contains 5000 titles. Lecky in his 'History of the rise and influence of rationalism in Europe' [2423] points out to the extirpation of Christianity from Japan, of Protestantism from Spain, of the Huguenots from France, of most Catholics from England. The Jesuits acted on the [2424] principle that the end justifies the means.

2423. Vide Lecky's work, vol. II p. 5 for these instances (ed. of 1890). The Toleration Act (1689) in England expressly excluded Catholics and Unitarians from the benefits of the Act. In 1401 the English Parliament passed the Statute for the burning of heretics which was not repealed until the Stuarts came back. Vide 'Conscience and Liberty' by Robert S. W. Pollard (1940) pages 46–48, for harsh laws in force in England a little over one hundred years ago against non-Conformists and Roman Catholics.

2424. Vide 'Rationalism in Theory and Practice' by Archibald Robertson (pub. by Watts & Co., 1954) p. 57 for the Jesuits. Vide p. 59 of the

(*Continued on next page*)

Their end was the 'greater glory of God', which meant to them the conversion of peoples and kingdoms to Roman Catholicism. Their means included incitements to assassination and to war. It has been mentioned above (p. 483) how Galileo was persecuted for espousing the Copernican theory in astronomy. Not much difference is made to religion whether the Sun revolves round the earth or the earth round the sun. In this connection it may be pointed out that Āryabhaṭa (born in 476 A. D.) appears to have held the view that the stars did not revolve round the earth, but the latter revolved round itself and gave the illustration of a man sitting in a moving boat feeling that it is the stationary objects on the banks that rush past in the opposite direction.[2425] The Pañcasiddhāntikā (13. 6) of Varāhamihira refers to this view and rejects it, not on the ground that it is opposed to the Veda, but on the ground that, if that view were correct, hawks and other birds flying high up in the sky would not be able to come back to their nests without fail. He did not know that the atmosphere also goes with the earth. This was more than eleven hundred years before Galileo and there is nothing to show that Āryabhaṭa suffered in the least for his views. For Āryabhaṭa's view vide 'Āryabhaṭīyam' by W. E. Clark (Chicago, 1930) p. 64. As observed by Archibald Robertson the history of the Rationalist movement in Europe is to a very great extent the history of a fight for the right to hold and propagate opinions unpopular for the time being and the growth of religious toleration in Europe has in fact gone hand in hand with the decay of traditional religious beliefs. Reason arrives at different conclusions on the same matter in different ages and even in the same age what appears reasonable to one group or people is held to be unreasonable by another people. Vide Robert Bridges' 'Testament of Beauty' Book I lines 465–470 on what is reasonable. Millions of people saw fruits falling from tree tops to the earth, but it was only the intuition and logic of Newton that enabled him to formulate the laws of gravitation.

(Continued from last page)

same book and also 'The flame and the light' by Hugh T. Anson Fausset (London, 1958) pp. 11–12, where the author says that Western man is very little sustained or guided by the doctrines of orthodox Christianity and that European civilization of the last five hundred years is dissolving.

2425 अनुलोमगतिर्नौस्थः पश्यत्यचलं विलोमगं यद्वत्। अचलानि भानि तद्वत्समपश्चिमगानि लङ्कायाम्॥ आर्यभटीय, गोलपाद verse 9.

Doubt has been and is a frequent and legitimate attitude of the mind as recognised by the Bṛ. Up. (I. 5. 3) 'Kāmaḥ saṅkalpo vicikitsā śraddhā, aśraddhā, dhritir, adhritir hrīr-dhīr-bhīr-etyetat sarvam mana eva' (desire, fancy, *doubt*, faith, want of faith, steadiness, restlessness, shame, understanding, fear, all these are aspects of mind). Even the Ṛgveda (II. 12. 5) refers to doubters about Indra (utem-āhur-naiṣostītyenam'). In the Kaṭha Up. Naciketas says "when a man dies there is the *doubt*, some saying 'he (the self) exists', others saying 'he ceases to exist" and prays to Yama to resolve that doubt for him as the third boon.

Descartes held that only one truth is beyond doubt viz. *cogito ergo sum* (I think, therefore I am). In Europe the whole of the 18th and 19th centuries were dominated as far as thoughtful men were concerned by boundless faith in reason and progress. But owing to the two world wars (particularly the second), their aftermath and the rise of two powerful Communist countries have greatly weakened the faith in progress guided by reason and ethics, faith in the dignity of man and in equality is on the decline and is assailed in many regions and the view that might creates or is right is gaining ground.

The Upaniṣads teach that a sound moral preparation must precede the acquisition of true vedāntic view. The Bṛ. Up. states 'therefore one who knows this, after securing quiescence, restraining his senses, being free from all hankerings, bearing with fortitude all pairs of opposites (such as heat and cold), having his mind concentrated, sees the Self in the self, looks upon everything as Ātman'; the Kaṭhopaniṣad II. 24 says 'one who has not ceased from doing evil actions, who is not quiescent, who has not concentrated his mind nor has made his mind quiescent would not realize this Self by correct knowledge'; Praśna I. 16 'those secure the pure world of *brahman* who are free from crookedness, falsehood and deceitful conduct'; Śv. Up. VI. 22 'this highly esoteric knowledge of Vedānta should not be imparted to one whose mind is not quiescent or who is not a son or disciple'. The great formula 'thou art That' teaches one to look upon all men as Ātman or as the Gītā (VI. 29–30) puts it 'he who is endowed with Yoga and knows Ātman to be in everything and everything as abiding in Ātman, is not lost to the Lord nor is the Lord lost to him'. Compare Īśā Up. 6 and Manu XII. 91. In the Chān. Up. (III. 16. 1) man is symbolically represented as sacrifice and in III. 17. 4 it is stated

that *tapas*, charity, straightforward conduct, ahiṁsā and truthfulness are the dakṣiṇā (sacrificial fees).

This shows that Vedānta in its highest form is the best support of pure morality for individuals. It is on account of this teaching that many sages cultivated these virtues in hermitages and were honoured by kings and common people in ancient times in India, but in medieval times the sages became[2426] rare and as regards common people they were tied down by customs and caste and very few people made strenuous efforts for solidarity of all their countrymen, for meeting their common needs and safeguarding all peoples' interests; and by the side of sublime philosophical tenets our country witnessed abject poverty among large masses of people and political domination by alien or brutal invaders. The tendency to rely on the Vedas, to believe and to argue that what has been is the best, and to appeal to the past has been very strong throughtout our history for centuries. Our motto must not be 'back to the Vedas' but rather 'forward with the Vedas'. While giving due weight to the Veda and authority, we must not condemn all independence in thought.

Some Western rationalists such as Bentham, James Mill and John S. Mill put forward the theory of utilitarianism which briefly comes to this that actions are to be judged by their consequences and are right in proportion as they tend to make for the greatest good or happiness of the community or of the greatest number. This theory has great drawbacks, the most important being that it is not really a moral theory at all as it does not tell us exactly what a man or community ought to do. Religions tell their followers what they ought to do or not to do. Another difficulty is that what may appear to one man as being for the greatest good of the greatest number may not be so accepted by others and further it is difficult to define what the greatest number regards as good or happiness. Besides, many men care nothing at all about the happiness of others. Moral, political and economic actions are confused by this doctrine. In practice, as the emphasis was put on happiness, this theory

---

2426. Even in these days our country can produce men imbued with the true spirit of Advaita-vedānta like Raman Maharshi, the sage of Arunachal (1879–1950) about whom Arthur Osborne has published a very interesting and revealing work 'Raman Maharshi and the path of Self-knowledge' (Rider and Co, 1954).

was made the excuse for epicurianism and indulgence in things material.

The present author is not at all against freedom of thought, but what he objects to is making a fetish of rationalism and making millions of common men and women waver in their faith and principles of conduct by the constant talk of the non-existence of God or of the individual soul &c. The rationalists and utilitarians hardly agree upon any values and principles of conduct to be inculcated among ordinary young men and women. If God and soul be eliminated, they have not been able to put something more valuable in their place, for which the young generation that is growing up would be ready to live laborious days or to sacrifice themselves. Though we may not subscribe to the position that the last word of wisdom on all religious and social matters is to be found in the Veda or in the works of ancient sages and writers, even wise men may hesitate before they decide the question whether we should carry on a campaign for eradicating beliefs in God and an immortal self. The Gītā strikes the right note for most people when it utters the warning (III. 26) 'let not the knowing or wise man (the *jñānin* or *vidvān*) unsettle the minds of the ignorant that are attached to (certain) actions (by habit); the enlightened man, himself doing all work in the true spirit of a yogin, should set others to do all actions.'

As a result of the two world wars in which unspeakable atrocities and barbarities[2427] were committed by highly educated and organized countries most of whose people professed Christianity, there is a revulsion of feeling and several eminent men are busy in attributing the present difficulties to the decay of religious belief and in inviting humanity to return to religion. But the crux of the problem is what religious beliefs and practices are to be inculcated and practised by men in the present age. It appears to the present writer that religions can hardly be a panacea for the ills of the world. Very large blocks of modern educated men are dissatisfied with the tenets and practices of several current religions and their authoritative books. The real difficulty to be grappled with is to

---

2427. Vide 'Scourge of the Svastika' by Lord Russell of Liverpool p. 171 where he cites the confession of Höss that not less than three million people were put to death at Auschwitz, 2500000 of them by gas chambers and on p. 250 he remarks 'the murder by the Germans of over five million European Jews constitutes the greatest crime in World History.'

define what must be the content of the faith that would appeal to and secure the allegiance of most or all good, intellectual and educated modern men. At different times different virtues (such as monachism, charity, humility, patriotism, social service or philanthrophism) were preached as of supreme importance. The growth of the virtue of patriotism and of the feeling of nationalism in Western countries was not due to Christianity's teachings but to various other causes in Europe's political and economic history. There are religious virtues, heroic virtues, amiable virtues &c. The Christian people of Europe and America during the last four centuries achieved great wealth and prosperity by throwing to the winds the virtues preached in the Sermon on the Mount, by extending their colonial empires for exploiting vast regions, by decimating millions of unoffending backward races, by hunting human beings as if they were beasts and forcing on them slavery and by preaching from the house tops the great need of competition in all spheres and worshipping it as if it were God. After the holocaust of the great wars, many eminent men, not only religious men, but even those that occupy positions in Government and political life, preach the necessity of the moral sense, of benevolence and kindness towards others, restraint, unselfishness and a desire to allow others to share in the good things of life, which virtues were emphasized for all men in the Br. Up. V. 2. 1-3 quoted above.[2428]

In India Emperor Aśoka in the 3rd century B. C. inculcated in his Edicts tolerance for the Brahmanic and the Buddhist faith (vide pp. 1011-12 above). Aśoka does not enter into dogma of any kind, but regarding himself as the father of all his subjects enjoins on them a morality that is practical and would be acceptable to all, such as tolerance, humanity, charity to monks and also to the poor and compassion towards dumb animals. Later on, it was at the most necessary to show that the doctrines put forth by reasoning were not directly opposed to the dicta

---

2428. Archibald Robertson in "Rationalism in theory and Practice" (*Watts and co, London 1954*) asserts (on page 41) that Christian morals have never been practised and that a society would not last for a month if run on the lines of the Sermon on the Mount. W. R. Mathews in 'Christ' (London, 1939) agrees (on page 76) with Professor Whitehead that the adoption of the principles of the Sermon on the Mount literally understood on any large scale would mean the sudden death of civilization. C. H. Tawney in 'Acquisitive Society' (1921) asserts that what was Christian in Christianity had largely disappeared from about 1700 A. D. (pages 12-13).

of the Veda. To take only one example: though the Upaniṣads express Advaita in such Mahāvākyas 'aham brahmāsmi' (Ch. Up. III. 14. 1), 'tat-tvam-asi' (Ch. Up. VI. 8. 7), Madhvācārya could expound his thorough-going *dvaita* doctrine, could explain away by reasoning the above passages and claim to be the only true expounder of Veda and denounce the *advaita* doctrine as Buddhism in disguise without any serious persecution on either side. Yājñavalkya (II. 192) calls upon the king to safeguard the special usages of guilds and heretics and their modes of livelihood. This tolerance for multiplicity of forms and practices in religion and for diametrically opposed philosophic views has had also its weakness viz. it permitted the growth of endless variations in the formulation of faith, ritual and philosophic doctrines and led in great measure to several abuses, to some unhealthy and even revolting practices.

SECTION IX

CHAPTER XXXIV

COSMOLOGY

All writers on Dharmaśāstra are agreed on the existence of God. They rarely enter upon the task of adducing arguments for the existence of God. Christian theologians for hundreds of years put forward various arguments pointing to the existence of God. They are briefly summarised in William James' 'Varieties of religious experience' p. 437 (ed. of 1920). The *cosmological argument reasons from the ordered universe to a* First Cause which must be conceived as God who must at least possess whatever perfection the universe itself contains. The argument from purpose or design (teleological argument) bases itself on the evidence of purpose or design in Nature and concludes that the First Cause (God) must be a creative intellect or mind. Then there are other arguments also such as the 'moral argument' (viz. the moral law presupposes a law-giver), the argument *ex consensu gentium* (viz. there is widespread belief in God all over the world and it should carry weight).[2429]

2429. Vide also F. W. West-way's 'Obsessions and convictions of the human intellect' (Blackie & Son, 1938), which adds a fifth to James' four viz., ontological argument (the very idea or concept of God makes the existence of God requisite) pp. 378–80. W. James in 'Pragmatism' (p. 109, ed. 1910) states that the evidence for the existence of God lies primarily in inner personal experience. Mr. Westway (on p. 374) gives a definite answer that there is no proof of the existence of God, but (on p. 387) he admits that the argument from design carries an extremely high degree of probability and that he believes that the Universe is not merely a chance-made affair as some philosophers believe. The argument from design (for God's existence) is held to have been shattered by the theory of evolution. If everything has a cause, it is also argued, why should God not have a cause? And it is said by some that there is no reason to suppose that the world had a beginning at all. This is the view of famous Mīmāṁsakas like Kumārila. Vide above pp. 1209–1210 and note 1963. H. G. Wells in his 'You can't be too careful' (London 1942, p. 282) holds that the idea of God's omniscience, omnipresence and omnipotence must be

(*Continued on next page*)

The Upaniṣads speak of the Absolute *brahman* as the creator, preserver and destroyer of the *bhūtas* (beings or elements or both). For example, the Tai. Up. III. 1 (Bhṛgu[2430] is instructed by his father Varuṇa) 'desire to know that from which all *bhūtas* spring, by which, after being created, they live (are sustained) and to which they return and are absorbed therein; that is *brahma*'. This is the basic text on which V. S. I. 1. 2 (janmādyasya yataḥ) is based. This means 'from which the creation (sustenance and dissolution) of this (world) proceed' (that is brahma). Another passage of the Tai. Up. (II. 1) states that 'from this Ātman Ākāśa sprang, from ākāśa Vāyu, from Vāyu Agni, from Agni waters, from waters the earth, from earth plants, from plants food, from food man'. A passage of the Chān. Up. states[2431] 'all this, indeed, is brahma; a man, cultivating restraint of the mind, should meditate on that (world) as springing from, ending in and breathing on account of that (brahma)'. This is the basis of V. S. I. 2. 1 (*sarvatra prasiddhopadeśāt*). Here the three attributes of brahma are creator, preserver and destroyer of the universe.

The Vedāntasūtra of Bādarāyaṇa further says that śāstras (sacred canon or texts) are the source of the correct knowledge

---

(*Continued from last page*)

abandoned, since, according to him, these are preposterous absolutes. On the other hand Dr, F. W. Jones in his work 'Design and purpose' (London, 1942) puts forward the view that many people are in danger of losing sight of the truth that the Cosmos is an ordered entity and that many have lost belief in the purpose of human life (p. 13). The teleological argument may strengthen the faith of a person who already believes in God, but it appears that it cannot create faith in God in the case of one who does not subscribe to that view. Abel Jones in 'In search of truth' (1945) holds that the three main arguments for the existence of God are cosmological, teleological and ontological.

2430. यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते येन जातानि जीवन्ति यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति तद् विजिज्ञासस्व। तद् ब्रह्मेति। तै. उप. III. 1.

2431. सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म तज्जलानिति शान्त उपासीत। छा. उप. III. 14. 1. The word तज्जलान् applied to brahma is peculiar; it is explained by शङ्कराचार्य as follows: तज्जलानिति। तस्माद् ब्रह्मणो जातं तेजोबन्नादिक्रमेण सर्वम्। अतस्तज्जम्। तथा तेनैव जननक्रमेण प्रतिलोमतया तस्मिन्नेव ब्रह्मणि लीयते तदात्मतया श्लिष्यते इति तल्लम्। तथा तस्मिन्नेव स्थितिकाले अनिति प्राणिति चेष्टते इति।. Vide also छा. उप. I. 9. 1 सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतान्याकाशादेव समुत्पद्यन्त आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्त्याकाशो ह्येवैभ्यो ज्यायान्। आकाशः परायणम्।.

of *brahma*.[2432] To the objection that the Veda is concerned with rites, that some portions of it are meant for the praise of rites, that the Vedic *mantras* only remind the performer about the various ingredients of sacrifice, that, therefore, the Vedānta texts either serve no purpose at all or at the most give information about the soul of the sacrificer or the deity to be worshipped in sacrifices, the reply is given by the Vedāntasūtra I. 1. 4 (*tat-tu samanvayāt*), which means that all Vedānta texts are agreed that their purport is to establish that brahma, which has been postulated (in V. S. I. 1. 2) as the creator, preserver and absorber of the world has that character and is omniscient and omnipotent.

That the argument from design also was present to the minds of the propounders of Vedānta follows from the fact that the Vedāntasūtra (II. 2. 1, racanānupapatteśca nānumānam) denies that the *Pradhāna* of the Sānkhya (that is postulated as *acetana*) can be inferred as the cause of the universe.[2433]

It may be noted here that, according to Śaṅkarācārya, the detailed[2434] statements on the doctrine about creation contained in the Upaniṣads are not to be taken literally, that no special purpose dependent thereon can be found nor is such a purpose laid down by Śruti (Veda), but all those statements are intended to lead on to the knowledge of *brahma* and to expound the non-difference of the world from brahma.[2435] From early times most

---

2432. शास्त्रयोनित्वात्। वे. सू. I 1. 3; शाङ्करभाष्य। यथोक्तमृग्वेदादिशास्त्रं योनिः कारणं प्रमाणमस्य ब्रह्मणो यथावत्स्वरूपाधिगमे। तत्तु समन्वयात्। वे. सू. I. 1. 4; भाष्य 'तद् ब्रह्म सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्ति जगदुत्पत्तिस्थितिलयकारणं वेदान्तशास्त्रादेवावगम्यते। कथम् समन्वयात्। सर्वेषु हि वेदान्तेषु वाक्यानि तात्पर्येणैतस्यार्थस्य प्रतिपादकत्वेन समनुगतानि।'

2433. अतो रचनानुपपत्तेश्च हेतोर्नाचेतनं जगत्कारणमनुमातव्यं भवति। शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू II. 2. 1.

2434. न ह्ययं सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चः प्रतिपिपादयिषितः। न हि तत्प्रतिबद्धः कश्चित्पुरुषार्थो दृश्यते श्रूयते वा। न च कल्पयितुं शक्यते, उपक्रमोपसंहाराभ्यां तत्र तत्र ब्रह्मविषयैर्वाक्यैः साकमेकवाक्यताया गम्यमानत्वात्। दर्शयति च सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रतिपत्त्यर्थताम्— 'अन्नेन सोम्य शुङ्गेनापो मूलमन्विच्छ ... सन्मूलमन्विच्छ' (छा. VI. 8. 4) इति। मृदादिदृष्टान्तैश्च कार्यस्य कारणेनाभेदं वदितुं सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चः श्राव्यत इति गम्यते। शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. I. 4. 14. For मृदादिदृष्टान्त, vide छा. उप. VI. 3. 4–6 यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्यात्। वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्॥ Again on V. S. IV. 3. 14 Śaṅkarācārya remarks: मृदादिदृष्टान्तैर्हि सतो ब्रह्मण एकस्य सत्यत्वं विकारस्य चानृतत्वं प्रतिपादयच्छास्त्रं नोत्पत्त्यादिपरं भवितुमर्हति। ... एवमुत्पत्त्यादिश्रुतीनामैकात्म्यावगमपरत्वान्नानेकशक्तियोगो ब्रह्मणः॥

2435. The following works may be read for cosmology of Vedic texts: H. W. Wallis on 'Cosmology of the Ṛgveda' (1887); 'Vedic mythology

(*Continued on next page*)

philosophers oscillate between the doctrine of the First Principle as immanent in the universe and the doctrine that God is the creator and is transcendent. The Ṛgveda and Upaniṣads appear to postulate the first doctrine according to which the Absolute enters into it when it creates the Universe (Tai. Up. II. 6 'tat sṛṣṭvā tad-evānuprāviśat'), Chān. Up. VI. 2. 1, VI. 3. 2, Bṛ. Up. I. 4. 10. They also speak of God as ruling the Universe (antaryāmin) as in Bṛ. Up. III. 7. Kauṣītaki Up. III. 8. At that time there was no atomic theory. Early Greek thought also wavered between the two doctrines. Later on came the rival theory of cosmology in which atoms played a great part, that was adumbrated by Democritus (died about 370 B. C. acc. to William James in 'Some Problems', and explained by Lucretius. In India also the Vaiśesikas put forward the theory that the world is paramāṇus (atoms). Kaṇāda or Kaṇabhuk (lit. one who assumes or subsists on kaṇas, very subtle particles) is the reputed founder of the Vaiśeṣika system. He does not expressly say anything about God. But later medieval writers on Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika combined the two doctrines of God and atoms. As the Tarkadīpikā[2436] puts the theory it is as follows: when God desires to create, activity is produced among the atoms, two atoms join, dvyaṇuka (dyad) is produced, tryaṇuka is produced from three dvyaṇukas and in the end the great earth is produced; of things created when God desires to bring about dissolution an activity is produced in the atoms. The atoms are eternal and infinite in number.

Though there was almost universal agreement about the existence of God among the Dharmaśāstra writers, there was (as in the[2437] West) divergence about the names, nature and

---

(*Continued from last page*)

by A. A. Macdonell pp. 8–15, Deussen's 'Philosophy of the Upanishads' translated into English by A. S. Geden (1906) pp. 180–253; 'Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and the Upanishads' by A. B. Keith, pp. 570–584. A recent work 'Theories of the Universe' by Milton K. Munitz (pub. by Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1957) deals with the cosmologies of several countries from Babylonian myth to modern science (but omits the Indian material).

2436. ईश्वरस्य चिकीर्षावशात्परमाणुषु क्रिया जायते। ततः परमाणुद्वयसंयोगे सति द्व्यणुकमुत्पद्यते त्रिभिर्द्व्यणुकैस्त्र्यणुकम्। एवं चतुरणुकादिक्रमेण महती पृथिवी ... वायुरुत्पद्यते। ... एवमुत्पन्नस्य कार्यद्रव्यस्य संजिहीर्षावशात् परमाणुषु क्रिया। तर्कदीपिका p. 9 (Athalye's 2nd ed. of 1918).

2437. In the West, Jeans in 'Mysterious Universe' (Cambridge 1931 goes so far as to say (on p. 134) 'the great Architect of the Universe...

(*Continued on next page*)

attributes of God. Most were agreed that God is one without a second, is spiritual (and not physical, though several people worshipped Him in the form of Śiva or Viṣṇu or Devī), immutable, omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, creator, holy, good and just &c. Difficult questions arise about belief in God. One or two may be mentioned: Is God omniscient in the completed and strictest sense viz. whether he could do anything whatever as he likes or whether there are certain things which he cannot do. Another question is whether all existing things other than himself have been created by him or whether there are some things whose existence is as ultimate as God's. All religions are faced with difficulties and therefore religion is a matter of faith.

Though the Ṛgveda is full of the deeds of and prayers to individual Gods (such as Agni, Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Soma), the Ṛgveda contains several hymns and verses to the effect that the original Principle is only one, that it creates the world out of itself, enters into it and inspires it. In Ṛg. I. 164. 46 the sage says 'the wise speak of the One existing (principle) under various names, they call it Agni, Yama, Mātariśvan (wind god)'. This is not a solitary verse. There are similar verses in the Ṛgveda. For example, Ṛgveda VIII. 58. 2 (a verse from the Vālakhilya hymns) says 'The one fire is kindled in many places, the one Sun appears in the whole world, the one Dawn shines over all this world and the One (Principle, Spirit) became all this'. In Ṛg. X. 90. 2, it is declared 'all this universe is (in reality) the Puruṣa alone, (both) what has been and what will come into existence in future'. In Ṛg. II. 1. 3-7 Agni is identified with Indra, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman, Tvaṣṭṛ, Rudra, Draviṇodas, Savitṛ and Bhaga. All these verses establish that ultimately all plurality is only a play of words, a mere name ('Vācārambhaṇam vikāro nāmadheyam' as the Chān. Up. VI. 1. 4 states) and that unity is the only Reality and that the fundamental teaching of the Upaniṣads appears in germ in the Ṛgveda.

(*Continued from last page*)

begins to appear as a pure mathematician.' Einstein, the greatest scientist of modern times, is reported to have cabled back to Rabbi H. S. Goldstein of New York (who asked by wire 'Do you believe in God) that 'I believe in Spinoza's God who reveals himself in the harmony of all beings, not in a God who concerns himself with the fate and actions of men.' In 'Out of my later years' he holds that the main conflict between science and religion lies in the concept of a personal God. Vide Viscount Samuel's address in the symposium 'In search of faith' edited by E. W. Martin p. 78, where four views on the relation of God and the world are mentioned.

In the Ṛgveda there are several hymns about the creation of the world in the 10th Maṇḍala (X. 72, X. 81 and 82, X. 90, X. 121, X. 129). For reasons of space all these cannot be set out at length, but some important texts will be mentioned. The main purpose of the hymn (X. 72) is to describe the birth of eight Ādityas. Ṛg. X. 72. 2 states[2438] that Brahmaṇaspati brought about the (births of) gods like a smith (that works with bellows) and that in the primeval ages of the Gods' *sat* was produced from *asat*. In Ṛg. X. 72. 4–5 and 8 it is said that Dakṣa was born from Aditi and Aditi from Dakṣa, that the gods were born after her (Aditi) and that from Aditi eight sons were born. The two hymns X. 81 and 82 refer to Viśvakarman who fashioned the worlds. X. 81. 2 and 4 ask questions 'what was the base[2439] (from where he created the world), what was the

2438. ब्रह्मणस्पतिरेता सं कर्मार इवाधमत्। देवानां पूर्व्ये युगेऽसतः सदजायत॥ ऋ. X. 72. 2. Here 'Asat' must be taken to mean 'undeveloped' (*Avyakta*) and not as meaning 'non-existent'. The Bṛ. Up. (I. 4. 7) states 'all this was then (before creation began) undeveloped and it was developed by name and form'. Similarly, in the Tai. Up. II. 7 it is said असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत् ततो वै सदजायत. But the Chān. Up. (VI. 3. 1–3) emphatically asserts "in the beginning there was that only which was 'sat', one only without a second; some say 'in the beginning there was that only which is *asat*, from which arose *sat*'; but how could it be thus, how would *sat* (that which is) spring from *asat* (that which is not)? It is sat only that was at the beginning, one without a second. It reflected 'may I be many, may I produce'; it created fire &c." Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. I. 4. 15 refers to Tai. Up. II. 7 'asad vā idam-agra āsit' and Chān. Up. III. 19. 1 'asad-evedam-agra āsīt' and explains what is meant by *asat* in such passages viz. 'नामरूपव्याकृतवस्तुविषयः प्रायेण सच्छब्दः प्रसिद्ध इति तद्व्याकरणाभावापेक्षया प्रागुत्पत्तेः सदेव ब्रह्मासदिवासीदित्युपचर्यते' and points out that in such passages Śruti itself adds words which give the go-by and refute the words 'asad-evedam' &c. In Ṛg. X. 72. 4 (aditer dakṣo ajāyata) Prof. Velankar (Pro. of All I. O. Conference, 17th Session in 1953) holds 'aditeḥ' to be in the genitive case (p. 62) and not in the ablative case, to avoid the riddle how Dakṣa and Aditi were born of each other; but that breaks the symmetry of the words, such as 'asataḥ', 'uttānapadaḥ', 'bhuvaḥ' that precede and are taken as ablatives The present author demurs to this explanation offered by Prof. Velankar.

2439. किं स्विदासीदधिष्ठानमारम्भणं कतमत्स्वित्कथासीत्। यतो भूमिं जनयन्विश्वकर्मा वि द्यामौर्णोन्महिना विश्वचक्षाः॥ विश्वतश्चक्षुरुत विश्वतोमुखो विश्वतोबाहुरुत विश्वतस्पात्। सं बाहुभ्यां धमति सं पतत्रैर्द्यावाभूमी जनयन्देव एकः॥ किं स्विद्वनं क उ स वृक्ष आस यतो द्यावापृथिवी निष्टतक्षुः। मनीषिणो मनसा पृच्छतेदु तद्यदध्यतिष्ठद्भुवनानि धारयन्॥ ऋ. X. 81. 2–4. The half verse किंस्विद्वनं occurs in Ṛg. X. 31. 7 also. सायण explains कथासीत् in the first verse as 'कथमभूत् किं स्वयं सदसद्वा भवेदित्यर्थः। उभयमपि नोपपद्यते।. सर्वे-

(*Continued on next page*)

material (out of which he fashioned the earth), what was the forest and the tree from which heaven and earth were chiselled out' and the third verse describes the one God as follows 'The one God who sees all round, whose face is turned in all directions, who has hands and feet everywhere, who when creating heaven and earth sends them forth with his (two) hands as with bellows and with wings' (as a bird is propelled). Ṛgveda X. 90 (containing 16 verses) is the famous hymn called Puruṣasūkta and postulates a supreme creator as a Puruṣa (called Ādipuruṣa by Sāyaṇa) with a thousand heads, eyes and feet, asserts that all this that has come into being and that is yet to come is Puruṣa, that from Puruṣa arose Virāj, from whom arose (what we may call the second) Puruṣa (Hiraṇyagarbha) whom the gods offered as *havis* (oblation or *paśu*) in a symbolical sacrifice in which the three seasons, Vasanta, Grīṣma and Śarad were respectively the ghee, the fuel and the *havis*. This hymn was probably composed at a time when, it appears, there was a firm belief (as in Śat. Br. V. 2. 4. 7, VI. 1. 1. 3 and Tai. S. VII. 4. 2. 1) that nothing great can be accomplished without *yajña* or *tapas*. The hymn then proceeds to say that from that primeval *yajña* all animals (horses, cows &c.), the four *varṇas*, the Sun, the Moon, Agni, Indra, the Veda, heaven and earth were produced. In the Atharvaveda XIX. 6 also there are 16 verses of which the first fifteen correspond with the first 15 verses of the Puruṣasūkta, but the order of verses is different and some of the words also are slightly changed. The Vāj. S. 31 has all the 16 verses of the Puruṣasūkta but it contains five more verses and a prose passage at the end. Ṛg. X. 121. 1 declares[2440] that in the beginning Hiraṇya-

(*Continued from last page*)

चहैतमङ्गमसङ्गः। असच्चेत् सदात्मकयोर्द्यावापृथिव्योरुपादानानर्हत्वात्। नाम्यत्किंचन मिषत् इति श्रुतेश्चेत्यभिप्रायः।". The तै. आ. (II. 8. 9. 3 ff) repeats all the verses of Ṛg. X. 129 except the 3rd verse and in II. 8. 9 6 states that the answer to the question किं स्विद्वनं (Ṛg. X. 81. 4) is ब्रह्म वनं ब्रह्म स वृक्ष आसीद्यतो द्यावापृथिवी निष्टतक्षुः। मनीषिणो मनसा विब्रवीमि वो ब्रह्माध्यतिष्ठद्भुवनानि धारयन्॥ 'Brahma was the forest and the tree from which they chiselled heaven and earth (and worlds)'.

2440. हिरण्यगर्भः समवर्तताग्रे भूतस्य जातः पतिरेक आसीत्। ऋ. X. 121. 1. The तै. सं. V. 5. 1. 2 provides 'हिरण्यगर्भः समवर्तताग्रे इत्याघारमाघारयति प्रजापतिर्वै हिरण्यगर्भः प्रजापतेरनुरूपत्वाय'. य आत्मदा बलदा यस्य विश्व उपासते प्रशिषं यस्य देवाः। यस्य छायामृतं यस्य मृत्युः कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम॥ ऋ. X. 121. 2. 'He gives life and strength, his commandments are honoured by all the Gods, whose shadow is immortality and also death; who is this God whom we worship with other offerings (or to what God we may offer worship with *havis* ?).

garbha (the Golden Egg) was born; and verse 10 identifies him with Prajāpati and verses 8 and 10 declare that waters were produced by him from which issues forth Hiranyagarbha (the Golden egg), which was Prajāpati Himself. The second verse is quoted in n. 1440. Ṛg. X. 125 is a hymn placed in the mouth of Vāk (speech), wherein speech is portrayed as a power even beyond the gods and as creative. Three (1, 6, 8) out of the eight verses may be rendered here 'I move along with the Rudras and Vasus, with the Ādityas and Viśvedevas; I support both Mitra and Varuṇa, Indra and Agni and the two Aśvins. I stretch the bow of Rudra in order to kill the enemy, the hater of *brahma* (sacred prayer); I cause war for men; I entered heaven and earth. I blow like the wind, producing all the worlds; I am beyond heaven and beyond this earth; by my greatness (power) I have become such a one'. Here one must hold that the sage is not referring to ordinary speech or language but to the conception that word has creative power and that it is one with God or was the thought uttered by *brahman.*

Ṛg. X. 129 (called Nāsadīya-sūkta from the opening words) is a unique hymn.[2441] Several passages of his hymn are yet very obscure in spite of the labour bestowed upon it by eminent scholars. In this hymn the First Principle or Creator is not given any name but is simply spoken of as 'tad-ekam', as done in the Upaniṣads in 'Tat-tvam-asi' or 'ekam-evādvitīyam' (Chān. Up. VI. 2.1-2.). The important and tolerably clear passages are translated here: "There was then neither 'asat' (what is not,

---

2441. नासदासीन्नो सदासीत्तदानीं नासीद्रजो नो व्योमा परो यत्। किमावरीवः कुह कस्य शर्मन्नम्भः किमासीद्गहनं गभीरम्॥ न मृत्युरासीदमृतं न तर्हि न रात्र्या अह्न आसीत् प्रकेतः। आनीदवातं स्वधया तदेकं तस्माद्धान्यन्न परः किं चनास॥ तम आसीत्तमसा गूळ्हमग्रेऽप्रकेतं सलिलं सर्वमा इदम्। ... कामस्तदग्रे समवर्तताधि मनसो रेतः प्रथमं यदासीत्। ... को अद्धा वेद क इह प्र वोचत् कुत आजाता कुत इयं विसृष्टिः। ... इयं विसृष्टिर्यत आबभूव यदि वा दधे यदि वा न। यो अस्याध्यक्षः परमे व्योमन् सो अङ्ग वेद यदि वा न वेद॥ ऋ. X. 129. 1-7. The शतपथब्राह्मण (X. 5. 3. 1-2) makes an interesting reference to this hymn: 'नेव वा इदमग्रेऽसदासीन्नेव सदासीत्। आसीदिव वा इदमग्रे नेवासीत्तद्ध तन्मन एवास। तस्मादेतदृषिणाभ्यनूक्तम्। नासदासीन्नो सदासीत्तदानीमिति। नेव हि सन्मनो नेवासत् तदिदं मनः सृष्टमाविरबुभूषत्।' This Br. makes it clear that this (Universe) was as it were neither non-existent nor existent and it further says 'in the beginning this (Universe) as it were existed and did not exist: there was then only the mind and that mind as it were was neither existent nor non-existent.' It may be noted that the Bhāgavatapurāṇa speaks of the Lord as importing the esoteric (guhya) Truth in verses 32-36 of II. 9; verse 32 which reminds us of Ṛg. X. 129. 1 is: अहमेवासमेवाग्रे नान्यद्यत्सदसत्परम्। पश्चादहं यदेतच्च योऽवशिष्येत सोऽस्म्यहम्॥.

non-being) nor 'sat' (what is); there was no sky nor the heaven which is beyond; what was it that covered all? Where was it and under whose shelter? Was there deep unfathomable abyss of waters?; (2) There was no death, hence nothing immortal; there was no consciousness (distinction) of night and day; that one breathed by its own nature (power) without there being any air, really nothing other than that existed; (4) desire came into being, that was the first flow (seed, offspring) of the mind; (6) who knows directly, who can proclaim it here whence this creation came into being; (7) He from whom arose this creation, whether he made it or did not make it, the Highest seer in the highest heaven, he indeed knows or even he does not know?

It would be noticed that the sage, who was a poet and philosopher, proclaimed that there was that one Being, raised high above all gods, conditions and limitations; he, the sage, gives expression to what he conceived to be the state before the creation of the universe. Night and day, death and immortality are opposites. These exist only when there is manifestness or creation and therefore he says 'there was no death, nor anything immortal'. The hymn does not say that there was non-being out of which being grew. What he means is that That One alone breathed, the opposites, being and non-being, did not exist. For translations and remarks on this hymn, vide Max-Müller's 'History of ancient Sanskrit Literature' (1859) pp. 539-566, and 'Six systems of Indian Philosophy' (1919 ed.) pp. 49-52, Dr. Radhakrishnan's 'Indian Philosophy' (1923), vol. I. pp. 100-104. Prof. Whitney (Proceedings of American Oriental Society Vol. XI p. CXI.), in his characteristic supercilious manner referred to above on p. 512, remarked that the praises bestowed on this hymn were nauseating. Deussen, long after Whitney's diatribe, said 'in its noble simplicity, in the loftiness of its philosophic vision, it is possibly the most admirable bit of the philosophy of olden times' and that 'no translation can ever do justice to the beauty of the original' (vide Bloomfield's 'The religion of the Veda,' p. 234, ed. of 1908). Vide Keith's 'Religion and philosophy of the Veda and Upanisads.' Vol. II. pp. 435-436. In many other passages of the Ṛgveda, different gods are referred to as creators. God Prajāpati is said to have created heaven and earth, the wide, deep, well formed and to have pushed them by his power without support (IV. 56. 3). Indra is said to have created the Sun and Uṣas (Ṛg. II. 12. 7) and to have established heaven without any beam to support, supported and spread the earth (Ṛg. II. 15. 2).

The creation hymns refer to a stage when there was no generally accepted theory about the origin of the world. But this much is clear that in the most ancient times, at least some of the Vedic sages had arrived at the theory that there was only one Principle or Spirit, though called by various names and that it willed to create the world and created it from itself.

Apart from the above-mentioned hymns that may be called creation hymns, the Ṛgveda contains many references to the creation or the support [2442] of heaven and earth by several gods and also creation of other things. In Ṛg. X. 89. 4 Indra is said to have made from heaven and earth on all sides as the axle does the wheels. Ṛg. I. 154. 4 refers to Viṣṇu who single-handed supports the three, viz. the earth, the heaven (and antarikṣa) and all the worlds. Mitra is said to support heaven and earth (Ṛg. III. 59. 1) and to bear all gods (Ṛg. III. 59. 8)[2443]. Brahmaṇaspati (Lord of Prayer, Bṛhaspati) is said to have sent forth (blazed) the births of gods like a blacksmith and that in the primeval times of the gods *sat* was born from *asat*. Soma is said (Ṛg. VI. 47. 4) to have made the width of the earth and the loftiness of the heaven and supported the wide antarikṣa (mid regions) and in Ṛg. II. 40 (which is addressed jointly to Soma-Pūṣan) it is said that one of them (Soma) produced all worlds and the other (Pūṣan, the Sun) goes overseeing or marking, the doings of the whole world (verse 5).

In Ṛg. VII. 78. 3 dawns (plural) are said to have created the Sun, Yajña and Agni. This is metaphorical, since after each dawn the Sun rises, sacrificial fire is kindled into flames and sacrifice is offered. In Ṛg. I. 96. 2 Agni is said to be the progenitor of men. In Ṛg. II. 35. 2 (apām napāt, grandson of waters i. e. Agni) is said to have created all worlds.

Heaven and earth (as dual divinities) have six hymns addressed to them in the Ṛg..viz. I. 159–160, 185, IV. 56, VI. 70, VII. 53) and they are called 'rodasī' and sisters (Ṛg. I. 185. 5). They are also called parents of the gods (Ṛg. VIII. 97. 8, X. 2. 7).

2442. य उ त्रिधातु पृथिवीमुत द्यामेको दाधार भुवनानि विश्वा। ऋ. 1. 154. 4. The word त्रिधातु occurs at least two dozen times in the Ṛgveda, but the meaning is not certain. In Ṛg. VIII 40 12 we have 'tridhātunā śarmaṇā pātam-asmān' (protect us with a three-fold protection) and it is difficult to say what 'tridhātu' protection is.

2443. ब्रह्मणस्पतिरेता...सदजायत। ऋ. X. 72. 2. एता refers to जाना (जन्मानि) in the first verse (देवानां नु वयं जाना प्रवोचाम विपन्यया). For the meaning of सत् and असत् vide note 2438 above.

The word 'antarikṣa' (atmospheric region) occurs at least a hundred times in the Ṛgveda. Sometimes we have phrases like (*tisraḥ pṛthvīḥ*) meaning the three worlds including the earth (Ṛg. I. 34. 8), while in other passages reference is made to lower, middle and highest pṛithivi as in Ṛg. I. 108. 9 (*yad indrāgnī avamasyām pṛthivyām madhyamasyām paramasyām uta sthaḥ*) meaning thereby the earth, antarikṣa and heaven. Antariksa is often called 'rajas' as the region of dust, mists and clouds in Ṛg. I. 35. 2 and 9).

In Ṛg. I. 35. 6 it is said 'there are three *dyaus* (i. e. heaven, antarikṣa and earth), two are on the lap of Savitṛ (i. e. heaven and earth) and one (antarikṣa) is in the world of Yama. The sage explains in Ṛg. X. 88. 15 'I have heard of two paths viz. of the pitṛs and of the gods and also of men; the whole world that moves reaches that (region) which is between the father (heaven) and the mother (the earth)'.

Varuṇa is said to have spread antarikṣa on forests, spread the Sun in heaven and Soma on mountains (Ṛg. V. 85. 2). Even in the times of the Ṛgveda speculation had begun about the distance between heaven and earth. In Ṛg. I. 155. 5 the poet says that no one dare soar up to the third step of Viṣṇu (i. e. heaven), not even the birds flying on their wings. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa the distance between the earth and heaven is put at one thousand days' journey for a horse.[2444]

In the Taittirīya Saṁhitā Prajāpati is frequently mentioned as creating the gods and asuras (III. 3. 7. 1), as creating yajñas (I. 6. 9. 1), as creating people (II. 1. 2. 1) and animals (I. 5. 9. 7) and desiring to create *prajā* and performing tapas for that (III. 1. 1. 1). Tai. S. (V. 6. 4. 2) states that all this in the beginning was water, a sea and that Prajāpati becoming wind floated rapidly on a lotus leaf.

The Atharvaveda has some hymns on creation. But they are verbose, repetitive and do not possess the depth, philosophy and terse style of the hymns of the Ṛgveda cited above. In hymns 7 and 8 of the 10th *kāṇḍa* it puts forward Skambha as the base and as identified with Prajāpati, as the creator and supporter of all worlds and as having all the thirty-three gods in himself; it asks 'by how much did Skambha enter the manifold

---

2444. सहस्रमनूच्यं स्वर्गकामस्य सहस्राश्वीने वा इतः स्वर्गो लोकः। ऐ. ब्रा. (7th अ, 7th खण्ड or 2nd पञ्चिका 17).

forms of the highest, lowest and middling type that Prajāpati created; how much is that in which he (Skambha) did not enter'? In Ṛg. IX. 86. 46 Soma made for sacrifice is spoken of as Skambha. Hymn 8 of kāṇḍa X (of Atharvaveda) is styled 'description of Jyeṣṭha-brahma' (the highest or oldest brahma). Two verses from it may be cited 'Obeisance to that *Jyeṣṭha Brahma* that governs all, whether produced or to be produced, and to whom alone heaven pertains. These two, heaven and earth, stand supported by Skambha; all this that has *Ātman*, that breathes and blinks is Skambha. Skambha literally means 'support' or 'pillar'. The verbal form 'Skabhnāti' occurs in Ṛg X. 6. 3 and the word 'Skambha' occurs several times in the Ṛg. but not in the sense of 'creator'. In Atharva X. 8. 2 Skambha is mentioned twice, while in X. 7[2445] (of 44 verses) it occurs many times. Atharva X. 2 is called Brahmaprakāśana hymn (of 33 verses). Numerous questions are asked in verses one to 19. In verses 20, 22, 24 questions are asked and verses 21, 23, 25 give replies to them. One question and answer may be set out 'By whom was this earth made (or arranged), by whom was the high heaven placed, by whom was the sky placed above and crosswise and in various directions'? 'Brahma made the earth, brahma is the heaven placed high, it is brahma that is the sky placed above, cross-wise and in various directions.' Verse 27 of Atharva X. 8 is the same as Śv. Up. IV. 3 and identifies the creator with young and old, men and women and boy and girl. In Atharva X. 8 several other deities also are mentioned but they are deemed to be comprehended in the Supreme Entity. In Atharva IX. 2 (25 verses) there is apotheosis of Kāma, in the first eighteen verses of which there are prayers to Kāma for vanquishing and driving away enemies, the last quarter of each of the verses 19 to 24 ends 'tasmai te Kāma nama it kṛṇomi' (I offer obeisance to you, O Kāma'). These six verses declare that Kāma appeared first, that neither the gods, nor pitṛs nor men reached Kāma who is greater than heaven and earth, waters, Agni, the directions, all beings that blink their eyes, the sea; Vāta, Agni, the Sun and the Moon do not reach Kāma.

2445. यस्मिन् स्तब्ध्वा प्रजापतिर्लोकान्सर्वां अधारयत्। स्कम्भं तं ब्रूहि कतमः स्विदेव सः॥ यत्परममवमं यच्च मध्यमं प्रजापतिः ससृजे विश्वरूपम्। कियता स्कम्भः प्रविवेश तत्र यन्न प्राविशत्कियत्तद् बभूव॥ यस्य त्रयस्त्रिंशद्देवा अङ्गे सर्वे समाहिताः। स्कम्भं तं ब्रूहि कतमः स्विदेव सः॥ अथर्व X. 7. 7, 8, 13; केनेयं भूमिर्विहिता केन द्यौरुत्तरा हिता। केनेदमूर्ध्वं तिर्यक् चान्तरिक्षं व्यचो हितम्॥ ब्रह्मणा भूमिर्विहिता ब्रह्म द्यौरुत्तरा हिता। ब्रह्मेदमूर्ध्वं तिर्यक्चान्तरिक्षं व्यचो हितम्। अथर्व० X. 2. 24-25.

Atharva XIX. 52 is a hymn[2446] of five verses addressed to Kāma, who is said to have appeared in the beginning and was the first flow of the mind.

Atharvaveda XI. 4 (26 verses) is addressed to Prāṇa, the first verse being 'obeisance to Prāṇa under whose domination is all this (world); he is the Lord of all and in him everything is centred (or established)' and verse 12 is 'Prāṇa is Virāj, Prāṇa is the directing power, all offer worship to Prāṇa, Prāṇa is indeed the Sun, the Moon and they (the sages) call him Prajāpati'.

In hymns 53 (10 verses) and 54 (5 verses) of Kāṇḍa 19 the Atharvaveda appears to put forward Kāla (time) as the first principle. Three of these are here translated. '*Tapas* is placed in Kāla, also the Jyeṣṭha Brahma, Kāla is the Lord of all, he was the father of Prajāpati; Kāla created people, in the beginning Kāla created Prajāpati, Svayambhū (Brahmā), Kaśyapa and *tapas* sprang from Kāla; from Kāla were born waters, *brahma*, *tapas* and directions, sun-rise is due to Kāla and it is merged in Kāla (at night).'

The Śat. Br. in many places speaks of creation. A few passages only can be referred to here. The Śat. Br. (in VI. 1. 1) starts by saying that 'in the beginning there was here the non-existent' and asserts that the non-existent was the sages, the vital airs and then it postulates Prajāpati (made from seven vital airs) who desired 'May I be more, may I have progeny'. 'He toiled and practised *tapas*, and being tired, he created first of all the *Brahman*, the triple lore (the three Vedas), that Prajāpati then created waters from Vāk that is the world; that he (Prajāpati) entered the waters with the triple lore and that thence an egg arose; he touched it, then earth was produced and so on.

In XI. 1. 6. 1 ff. the Śat. Br. states "In the beginning this was water, only a sea. The waters desired 'How shall we have

---

2446. कामस्तदग्रे समवर्तत मनसो रेतः प्रथमं यदासीत्। स काम कामेन बृहता सयोनी रायस्पोषं यजमानाय धेहि॥ अथर्व० XIX. 52 1. For मनसो रेतः, compare Ṛg. X. 129. 4 quoted above in n. 2441; प्राणाय नमो यस्य सर्वमिदं वशे। यो भूतः सर्वस्येश्वरो यस्मिन्सर्वं प्रतिष्ठितम्॥ प्राणो विराट् प्राणो देष्ट्री प्राणं सर्व उपासते। प्राणो ह सूर्यश्चन्द्रमाः प्राणमाहुः प्रजापतिम्॥ अथर्व० XI. 4. 1 and 12; काले तपः काले ज्येष्ठं काले ब्रह्म समाहितम्। कालो ह सर्वस्येश्वरो यः पितासीत्प्रजापतेः॥ कालः प्रजा असृजत कालो अग्रे प्रजापतिम्। स्वयंभूः कश्यपः कालात्तपः कालादजायत॥ अथर्व XIX. 53. 8 and 10; कालादापः समभवन् कालाद् ब्रह्म तपो दिशः। कालेनोदेति सूर्यः काले नि विशते पुनः॥ अथर्व० XIX. 54. 1.

progeny?' They toiled and practised austerities; while they were doing this a golden egg was produced, which floated for about a year, in about a year's time a Puruṣa, Prajāpati, was born; he broke open the egg; he created the Gods by (the breath of) his mouth; he created Agni, Indra, Soma" &c.

In XI. 2. 3. 1–2 the Śat. Br. says—In the beginning this (universe) was *brahma*, it created the gods, Agni, Vāyu, Sūrya; then a reference is made to name and form (nāma-rūpe) by which he descends into the worlds and it is said 'these two (nāmarūpe) are the great manifestations of *brahma*'.

This myth about a golden egg of the universe is developed from Ṛg. X. 129. 3 and X. 121. 1 (Hiraṇyagarbhaḥ samavartatāgre) in the Ch. Up. III. 19. 1–2 'In the beginning this universe was *asat* (not unfolded), it became *sat* (began to unfold), it was born (i. e. it took form); then an egg was evolved; it lay (in waters) for the period of a year; then it broke up, the two halves were one of silver and the other of gold; the silver half is this earth and the golden half is heaven'. This is followed in Manusmṛti as will be shown later on.

It is stated in the Śat. Br. X. 4. 2. 22–23 that Prajāpati arranged the Ṛgveda in such a way that the number of syllables in the Ṛgveda come to 12000 Bṛhatī metres (each Bṛhatī has 36 syllables).

The Tai. Br. states "Prajāpati created Gods and asuras (II. 2. 3) but he did not create Indra; the Gods said to him 'create Indra for us'; just as I created you by means of tapas in the same way you create Indra; they practised tapas and they saw Indra (abiding) in themselves (i. e. in their hearts) they said to him 'be born'". In II. 2. 9. 1 the Tai.[2447] Br. states "this universe was nothing at all in the beginning; there was no heaven nor earth nor mid region; that non-existent created Mind with the thought 'let me be'". In II. 6. 2. 3 the same Brāhmaṇa says "Prajāpati created by the help of Veda the two forms 'sat' and 'asat'". The Tai. Br. in II. 8. 8. 9–10 cites as Puronuvākyā and Yājyā of puroḍāśa and puronuvākyā of 'havis' as follows: 'Brahma produced the Gods and all this world;

2447. इदं वा अग्रे नैव किंचनासीत्। न द्यौरासीत्। न पृथिवी। नान्तरिक्षम्। तदसदेव सन् मनोऽकुरुत स्यामिति। तै. ब्रा. II. 2. 9. 1. ब्रह्म देवानजनयत् ब्रह्म विश्वमिदं जगत्। ब्रह्मणा क्षत्रं निर्मितम्। ब्रह्म ब्राह्मण आत्मना॥ अन्तरस्मिन्निमे लोकाः। ब्रह्मैव भूतानां ज्येष्ठम्। तेन कोऽर्हति स्पर्धितुम्॥ ब्रह्मन्देवास्त्रयस्त्रिंशत्। ब्रह्मन्निन्द्रप्रजापती। ब्रह्मन् ह विश्वा भूतानि। नावीवान्तः समाहिता॥ तै. ब्रा. II. 8. 8. 9–10.

the kṣatriyas were produced from brahman and brahma transformed its form into brāhmaṇas; (Yājyā) 'these worlds abide inside *brahman*, similarly all this world is inside it; brahma is the best among all bhūtas; who vie or compete with it, brahman is thirty-three Gods, and all bhūtas, all placed inside it as in a boat'.

In the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa there are brief allusions to Prajāpati. In VI. 1 it is stated 'Prajāpati, desirous of progeny, practised *tapas*; while he was thus practising tapas five were born, viz. Agni, Vāyu, Āditya, the Moon and Uṣas as fifth;' in VI. 10 it is said 'Prajāpati practised tapas; after having practised tapas, he produced this world (the earth) from *prāṇa*, the mid regions from *apāna* and the yonder world (heaven) from *vyāna*; he then created Agni, Vayu and Āditya respectively from the earth, mid regions and heaven, and he produced *ṛk* verses from Agni, *yajus* texts from Vāyu and *sāman* texts from Āditya; in XIII. 1 it is asserted 'Prajāpati is indeed yajña, in which all desires, all immortality are centered'; in XXVIII. 1 it is said 'Prajāpati created yajña, the gods worshipped by means of yajña, when it was created and thereby obtained all desired objects.'[2148]

The chief aim and purpose of the Brāhmaṇas of the Veda are to prescribe the acts and parts of the ritual of various sacrifices, to set out some myths and legends for their origin and to postulate various rewards on the performance of numerous sacrifices.

Prajāpati, who is mentioned very rarely in the Ṛgveda (IV. 53. 2 where Savitṛ is called Prajāpati, IX. 5. 9 where Soma is called Prajāpati, X. 85. 4 where in the marriage hymn Prajāpati is prayed to bestow offspring, X. 169. 4 where Prajāpati is invoked to bestow good cows, X. 184. 1 where Prajāpati along with other gods and goddesses is invoked for the blessing of conception in a married woman, X. 121. 10 (already referred to above on p. 1490), becomes the most prominent god in the Brāhmaṇas. The Ait. Br. narrates the story that after Indra killed Vṛtra he wanted to be great and honoured in place of Prajāpati, that then Prajāpati said (if you are to be great) 'who am I going

2448. प्रजापतिर्वै यज्ञस्तस्मिन्सर्वे कामाः सर्वममृतत्वम्। कौषी. ब्रा. XIII. 1 (Lindner's ed. Jena, 1887); प्रजापतिर्ह यज्ञं ससृजे तेन ह सृष्टेन देवा ईजिरे तेन ह सर्वान्कामानापुः। *ibid* XXVIII. 1.

to be' (koham-iti) and thereby Prajāpati came to be called 'Ka'.[2449]

The Ait. Br. states that Prajāpati desiring to propagate and to be many and having practised tapas created the three worlds, earth, mid region and heaven from which arose three lights (*jyotis*), Agni, Vāyu and Āditya, from which arose the three Vedas &c.

The Vedic Saṁhitās and Brāhmaṇas show that the popular belief about the individual self was that by good deeds the soul reaches heaven, becomes immortal and enjoys various joys and pleasures. Vide Ṛg. IX. 113. 7-11, I. 125. 4-6, Atharva IV. 34. 2 and 5, VI. 120. 3. There was also the idea of retribution and recompense for evil or harmful acts done by one person to another. For example, the Śat Br. says (XII. 9. 1. 1) 'for whatever food a man eats in this world, by the very same is he eaten again in the other world.' Vide also Śat. Br. XI. 6. 1. But when we come to the Upaniṣads, the whole intellectual atmosphere is changed. The Upaniṣads frequently assert that Ātman is the only reality, that there is nothing else and that the Ātman can only be described as 'not this-not this' i. e. the Ātman is unknowable. This is the first and foremost aspect of Vedānta. But this lofty metaphysical conception clashed with the ideas of common people who thought that a real universe existed apart from the Creator. The higher philosophic minds had to concede the reality of the universe for common people. They were prepared to say that the universe exists; in truth, however, it is nothing but the Ātman entered into the universe. They said that the world was phenomenal, not false or nothing, but the world had the Ātman behind it. This was the good aspect of the Vedānta viz. that the universe evolved from the first principle, *brahma*. They distinguished between *saguṇa* (qualified) *brahman* that was for prayer and worship (upāsanā), and for practical purposes (vyavahārāvasthā) and *nirguṇa* (unqualified) *brahma*. But the higher thought also insisted that the highest truth (pāramārthikasatya) is that *brahman* is one, that everything in the world (men, animals, inorganic matter)

2449. In Ṛg. X. 121 the last quarter of the first 9 verses is "Kasmai devāya haviṣā vidhema" (to what god shall we offer havis?). Then the 10th and last verse addresses Prajāpati with the words 'there is no God other than you who encompassed all these creations.'. It is probably due to this that from 'kasmai' (in the first nine verses) Prajāpati came to be called 'Ka'.

is brahman ('*sarvam khalvidam brahma*' Chān. Up. III. 14. 1, 'aham brahmāsmiti tasmāt tatsarvam-abhavat' Bṛ. Up. I. 4. 10). The Ait. Up. quoted below is most emphatic about the identity [2450] of the first principle with men, beasts, motionless beings and other passages do the same. As regards the elements the Bṛ. Up. has a long passage [2451] (III. 7. 2-23) in which Yājñavalkya propounds to Uddālaka Āruṇi the sublime doctrine viz. that the Ātman residing in the earth and other elements is inside them, whom they (the elements) do not know, whose body is the earth and other elements, who rules from within the earth and others, that that Ātman is the soul of thee (and of mine and others), is the inner ruler and is immortal. The last part of this passage is 'the ruler within is unseen but seeing, unheard but hearing, unperceived but perceiving, unknown but knowing, there is no other seer but he, there is no other hearer but he, that is no other perceiver but he, there is no other knower but he. This is the Self, the ruler within, the immortal. Everything else is distress' This whole section called

---

2450. आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीन्नान्यत्किंचन मिषत्। स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति। स इमाँल्लोकानसृजताम्भो मरीचीर्मरमापः।...स ईक्षत इमे नु लोकाः। लोकपालान्नु सृजा इति। सो अद्भ्य एव पुरुषं समुद्धृत्यामूर्छयत्।... स ईक्षत कथं न्विदं मदृते स्यादिति। स ईक्षत कतरेण प्रपद्या इति।...स एतमेव सीमानं विदार्यैतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत। ऐ. उप. I. 1-3, I. 3. 11-12. This passage is dealt with in V. S. III. 3. 16 which establishes that here the word Ātman stands for Paramātman, अम्भः, मरीचीः, मरं, आपः stand for heaven, mid-region, earth and waters below the earth.

2451. यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन् पृथिव्या अन्तरो यं पृथिवी न वेद यस्य पृथिवी शरीरं यः पृथिवीमन्तरो यमयत्येष त आत्माऽन्तर्याम्यमृतः।... अदृष्टो द्रष्टाऽश्रुतः श्रोताऽमतो मन्ताऽविज्ञातो विज्ञाता।... एष त आत्माऽन्तर्याम्यमृतः। अतोऽन्यदार्तम्। बृह. उप. III. 7. 3 and 23; compare with this last, बृह. उप. III. 4. 2 कतमो याज्ञवल्क्य सर्वान्तरः। न दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारं पश्येः ... एष त आत्मा सर्वान्तरः। अतोऽन्यदार्तम् and III. 5. 2. शंकराचार्य in his भाष्य on the last passage explains अतोऽन्यदार्तं as 'एतदेवैकमनार्तमविनाशि कूटस्थम्' and so आर्त means liable to sorrow, infatuation, old age and death, as appears from the question and answer in बृह. उप. III. 5. 1 कतमो याज्ञवल्क्य सर्वान्तरः। योऽशनायापिपासे शोकं मोहं जरां मृत्युमत्येति।. After quoting this passage Rene Grousset in 'Sum of History' tr. into English by A. and H. Temple Patterson (1951) pays a handsome compliment to it (on p. 95) 'what better introduction to Christianity is there than the conception of the sanctity of the human individual and of the universe as temples of God.' In ऐ. उप. III. 2 we are given 17 words that are said to be names of Prajñāna (i. e. *brahman*) and then ऐ. उप. III. 3 runs 'एष ब्रह्मा, एष इन्द्रः, एष प्रजापतिः, एते सर्वे देवाः, इमानि च पञ्च महाभूतानि पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योतींषि, एतानीमानि च क्षुद्रमिश्राणीव बीजानीतराणि चेतराणि चाण्डजानि च जारुजानि स्वेदजानि चोद्भिज्जानि चाश्वा गावः पुरुषा हस्तिनो यत्किंचेदं प्राणि जङ्गमं च पतत्रि च यच्च स्थावरं सर्वं तत्प्रज्ञानेत्रं प्रज्ञाने प्रतिष्ठितम्। प्रज्ञानेत्रो लोकः। प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठा। प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म।'. This carries to its logical conclusion the idea in the Puruṣasūkta X. 90. 6, 8, 10.

antaryāmi-brāhmaṇa has a parallel in Bṛ. Up. II. 5 (Madhu-vidyā). The ordinary man's conception of *brahman* as the creator was not, however, entirely given up by the thinkers in the Upaniṣads, though it was said that that concept was due to *avidyā* (ignorance about Reality). Brahman conceived as creator was called Īśvara (a personal God), though the worshipper might know that brahman in essence is above all conditions and limitations of personality. This is theism, which acknowledges three entities viz. a real world, the Paramātman (creative Ātman) and the individual self dependent on Paramātman. But the real thought of the Upaniṣads is centred round the non-difference of *brahman* and *ātman* and the physical world. This thought that *brahman* entered into what are called individual souls and also the material universe is the third aspect of Vedānta. On V. S II. 3. 43 Śaṅkarācārya quotes passages from the Brahma-sūkta belonging to the Atharvaveda[2452] and from the Śv. Up. expressive of the identity with *brahman* of fishermen, slaves, gamblers, of men and women, of boys and girls and old men tottering on a staff. The faith that the same Spirit animates the universe, from the stone, worms and beasts to man, is an elevating one, may make one feel that all creatures are brethren seeking the Creator and may, in a world dominated by egoism and urged to activities for individual prosperity and benefit, introduce some sweetness and consolation. Deussen in 'The philosophy of the Upanishads' (translated by A. S. Geden, Edinburgh, 1906) pays a glowing tribute to the sages of the Upanishads in the following eloquent passage 'It was here that for the first time the original thinkers of the Upanishads, to their immortal honour, found it (key) when they recognized our *ātman*, our inmost individual being, as the *Brahman*, the inmost being of universal nature and of all her phenomena' (p. 40). Vide also J. Royce in 'The world and the individual', First series of Lectures, particularly pp. 156-175 for the exposition of Chān. Up. III. 14 and VI. 2-15 and the Bṛ. Up. dialogue between Yāj. and Maitreyī

The Upaniṣads are full of theories of creation and of the nature of the First Principle A few passages may first be cited

2452. एके शाखिनो दाशकितवादिभावं ब्रह्मण आमनन्त्याथर्वणिका ब्रह्मसूक्ते-ब्रह्म दाशा ब्रह्म दासा ब्रह्मैवेमे कितवाः-इत्यादिना। ... इति हीनजन्तूदाहरणेन सर्वेषामेव नामरूप-कृतकार्यकरणसङ्घातप्रविष्टानां जीवानां ब्रह्मत्वमाह। तथान्यत्रापि ब्रह्मप्रक्रियायामेवायमर्थः प्रपञ्च्यते। त्वं स्त्री त्वं पुमानसि त्वं कुमार उत वा कुमारी। त्वं जीर्णो दण्डेन वञ्चसि त्वं जातो भवसि विश्वतोमुखः। इति।. The last is अथर्व० X. 8 27 and श्वेता. उप. 4. 3.

about creation. The Bṛ. Up. I. 4 (in 3-4, 7) has an original and significant passage on creation. Some part of it is set out here 'In the beginning this was Ātman alone in the form of Puruṣa; He (being alone) found no pleasure; he desired to have a second (a companion); he became of the extent of a male and a female in close embrace; he made this very Ātman fall aside in two parts that became husband and wife; from them were born men and he produced lower animals up to ants; this (universe) was then undeveloped (or not unfolded), it was then developed in names and forms; that (Ātman) entered into this up to the finger tips, just as a razor remains hidden in a sheath or just as the all supporting (fire) is not seen in wood'. In this passage the popular idea of the creation of the world is taken up and related to the one reality, Ātman, and the emphasis appears to be placed on the theory that the sole reality is Ātman, under the phantasmagoria of world phenomena. In Ch. Up. VII. 10. 1 it is said 'this earth, mid regions, heaven, gods and men, beasts and birds. grass and herbs, animals including insects, butterflies, ants. These are all nothing but waters in solid form.' The Chān. Up. (VI. 2. 3-4 and VI. 3. 2-3) states "in the beginning *Sat* alone was existent, one without a second; it thought 'I shall become many, I shall have progeny"; it created heat (tejas); from tejas waters were produced, from water food; that divinity proposed 'I shall enter into these three divinities (heat, water and food) with this living self and unfold name and form'. Here reference is made to three elements only viz. *tejas*, water, and earth (*anna* is produced from plants which spring from the earth). It is not, however, proper to hold that only three were then recognized, these three were the most obvious and the other two Vāyu and Ākāśa mentioned in Ait. and Tai. Up. are elusive. The Ait. Up. (quoted in note 2451) begins "In the beginning there was here this *Ātman* alone, there was nothing else that was active (lit. that opened and closed eyes); He reflected' I shall create worlds'. He created these worlds, the *ambhas* (water above heaven), marīci 'rays' (i. e.) atmospheric region, death, waters". Then the Up. proceeds: He created guardians of worlds and proposed to produce food for them. Then he reflected 'how can this frame subsist apart from me? Then he reflected 'by what way shall I enter into it?' Then it is stated that he split open the crown of the head and entered by that door. The Tai. Up. II. 6 says "He (the Ātman) desired 'May I become many, I shall have progeny'; having practised tapas, he created all this (universe) whatever it is; after having created it he

entered into it" and again in II. 7 'in the beginning this was *asat* (not unfolded), then it became *sat* (developed), it unfolded itself'. This is the basis of V. S. I. 4. 26 (ātmakṛteḥ pariṇāmāt) which establishes that brahman is both *kartṛ* (agent) and *karma* (object) of creation. The same Up. in II. 1 speaks of the creation of ākāśa from the Ātman, of Vāyu from ākāśa, of Agni from Vāyu, of waters from Agni and of the earth from waters. Here we have five elements instead of three (as in the Chān. Up.). The Ait. Up. III. 3 names the five elements and calls them Mahābhūtāni (though the usual order is not followed); so do Praśna VI. 4, Śv. Up. II. 12, Kaṭha III. 15 (where the five guṇas, śabda, sparśa, rūpa, rasa and gandha, each peculiar to the five elements from ākāśa to pṛthvī, are mentioned).[2453]

2453. Prof. George Sarton in 'A History of Science' (Harvard University Press, 1952) states (p. 247) that Empedocles born about 490 B. C. (in Greece) postulated only four elements; fire, air, water and earth and that a fifth, ether, was added by Plato and Aristotle. Vide also Introduction (p. 11) to Plato's Timaeus (in Loeb's classical library, Vol. VII, ed. of 1952) translated by Rev. R. G. Bury. Plato's exuberant imagination constructed the physical world on the pattern of geometrical figures most familiar to him and assigned the cube to earth and different kinds of triangles to fire, air and water (vide Jowett's translation of Timaeus, Vol. III pp. 638–639). The Greek philosophers relied on reason and not on ancient texts (as Indian sages did) and Plato's philosophy and cosmology were looked upon as the acme of wisdom even up to the 19th century, but Sarton (on p. 420 of the above work) remarks that modern men of science can regard it only as a monument of unwisdom and recklessness (rather a harsh judgment). Dr. W. M. Smart in 'Origin of the Earth' remarks that in probing into the mystery of creation science has not been more successful than the poetic Hebrew expounders of cosmology (pp. 8–9). For comparison of ancient Indian ideas on cosmology with those of ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Hebrews, and Greeks one may read a small book in the 'Corridors of Time' Series' Vol. I on 'Apes and men' by H. Peak and H. J. H. Fleure pp. 6–8 (Oxford, 1927); on p. 7 there is a figure of a Babylonian tablet recording part of the creation story. On p. 56 it states that the probable place of the origin of man and the period at which human story began are matters of great speculation. The principal questions that arise in cosmology are: (1) when were the earth and planets produced, (2) what is the process that accounts for the present state of the earth and the solar and other systems. Sanskrit works from the Ṛgveda down to the Purāṇas tried to answer these questions in their own ways. During the last one hundred years or so the theories of Lemaitre and Darwin and the developments in the sciences of Geology, Biology, Physics and Astronomy have revolutionized the whole conception of cosmology. Even the work of Sir A. Eddington 'The expanding Universe' (Cambridge, 1933) has become

(*Continued on next page*)

It has already been shown that in the Tai. Up. and the Chān. Up. (vide note 2430) it is stated that the bhūtas spring from and are absorbed in *brahman*. The order of dissolution is the reverse of that of creation. This is stated by the Vedāntasūtra II. 3. 14 ('*viparyayeṇa tu kramoऽta upapadyate ca*'). Śaṅkarācārya in his bhāṣya quotes a verse of the Śāntiparva in support of this.[2454]

The theory of yugas, mahāyugas, manvantaras and kalpas has already been dealt with in vol. III. pp. 885–896 and above pp. 686–692. The dissolution of the world was called *pralaya* which was said to be of four kinds (vide above pp. 693–95), two of which are *naimittika pralaya* (which occurs at the end of a day of Brahmā, that is equal to 1000 mahāyugas) and Prākṛtika (when everything including Prakṛti is dissolved in Paramātman). The Gītā (VIII. 17–18) and Manu I. 73 state that the day of Brahmā is equal to one thousand yugas and the night is also of the same duration, that all manifested things spring from the unmanifested (First Principle) at the beginning of the day (of Brahmā) and at the coming of the night (of Brahmā) they merge in the same unmanifested (Principle). The present author does not like the disagreeable task of comparing Sanskrit cosmology with the theories in other religious scriptures such as the Bible, but will only refer to some Western writers on that subject. About these ideas of creation and dissolution of the universe René Grousset in the work mentioned above observes (p. 96) 'the same power of synthesis appears in the ancient Indian cosmogonies which transcend in their breadth all that the Ionian philosophers or Lucretius have left us. In them the

---

(*Continued from last page*)

somewhat outmoded by recent discoveries. The present author does not know much of science. But from what little he has read in a few scientific works he may say that the history of science makes it clear that the actual state of man's scientific knowledge is provisional, that scientific theories are always subject to corrections and modifications. For instance, Newton's laws of motion were regarded for over two hundred years as absolutely correct enunciations of fundamental and universal laws of physics, but in recent times they have been found to be mere approximations.

2454. स्मृतावप्युत्पत्तिक्रमाविपर्ययेणैवाप्ययस्तत्र तत्र प्रदर्शितः । 'जगत्प्रतिष्ठा देवर्षे पृथिव्यप्सु प्रलीयते । ज्योतिष्यापः प्रलीयन्ते ज्योतिर्वायौ प्रलीयते ॥' इत्यादौ. This verse is शान्तिपर्व 340. 29 (=326. 28 of cr. ed.). The three following verses (which occur in both editions) may be cited here: खे वायुः प्रलयं याति मनस्याकाशमेव च । मनो हि परमं भूतं तदव्यक्ते प्रलीयते ॥ अव्यक्तं पुरुषे ब्रह्मन् निष्क्रिये संप्रलीयते । नास्ति तस्मात्परतरं पुरुषाद्वै सनातनात् ॥ नित्यं हि नास्ति जगति भूतं स्थावरजङ्गमम् । ऋते तमेकं पुरुषं वासुदेवं सनातनम् ॥,

world alternates between periods of creation (which correspond to the activity of the Demiurge) and of dissolution (which correspond to the slumber of the God)'. Similarly, Gerald Heard remarks (in 'Is God evident' Faber and Faber, London, 1950) 'Final and most helpful fact is that Sanskrit cosmology not only gets rid of intellectual difficulties such as the crude Hebrew Geology and Astronomy fossilized in the Christian dogmas, but it gets rid likewise of those more serious moral difficulties such as eternal damnation, pre-destination and that this life is man's only chance' (p. 51).

The high metaphysical conception that in reality there is no universe outside *brahman* (i. e. brahman is one and is unqualified, *nirguṇa*) and the popular empirical conception that there is a personal God who creates (*saguṇa brahma*) and real universe, often run together in the Upaniṣads. The Praśna Up. V. 2 asserts that *Om* is both *para* (highest) *brahma* and *apara* (other, lower) brahma. Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. I. 1. 12 (ānandamayo'bhyāsāt) states that in the Upaniṣads brahman is described in two ways, (firstly) as qualified by various adjuncts such as name and form and created objects and meant to be worshipped and (secondly) as devoid of all adjuncts (as meant to be mystically realized). As instances of the 2nd way (*nirupādhika* or *nirguṇa brahman*) he instances several passages viz. Br. Up. IV. 5. 15 ('where there is as it were duality, there one sees the other ...... one touches the other or knows the other, but where one has come to realize that all is only Ātman, whom will one see, with what will one understand the knower himself'), Bṛ. Up. III. 9. 26 = IV. 4. 22 and IV. 5. 15 (this self is to be spoken of as 'not this, 'not this'), Bṛ. Up. III. 8. 8 (it is that imperishable one that the brāhmaṇas speak about as neither coarse nor small, neither short nor long, neither red nor fluid, neither wind nor ether...neither as having an inside nor outside &c.); Chān. Up. (VII. 24. 1 'where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else that is the Infinite; where one sees something else, hears something else, understands something else, that is small (finite); the Infinite is immortal, the finite is mortal; the Infinite rests in its own greatness, or does not rest in greatness); Śv. Up. VI. 19 (who is without parts, without activities, tranquil, faultless, without taint, the highest bridge to immortality, like a fire that has consumed its fuel). There are also other passages of the same import e. g. Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 19 (neha nānāsti kiñcana, there is no diversity in it), Kaṭha Up. IV. 10-11 (mṛtyoḥ sa mṛtyum-āpnoti ya iha nāneva

paśyati). The 4th aspect of Upaniṣadic thought is concerned with the destiny of the self after the death of the body and the matters that govern it (i. e. Ethics and Eschatology).

These passages emphasize that it is impossible to describe what *brahman* is and that we can only say what it is not. Śaṅkarācārya[2455] on V. S. III. 2. 17 refers to the dialogue of Bāṣkali and Bādhva where Bādhva declared the characteristic of *brahman* by his silence. Bāṣkali said 'Sir, tell me about brahma'; then Bādhva remained silent; when Bāṣkali asked a second and a third time Bādhva replied 'we have been telling you indeed; but you don't understand; this self is still (without any activity)'. J. Royce in 'The world and the individual' vol. I. p. 148 is just like this episode of Bāṣkali and Bādhva "Believe not those prattlers' says one often quoted mystical work 'who boast that they know God.' Who knows Him is silent". Śaṅkarācārya puts the distinction between para-brahma and apara-brahma (personal God) as follows: Where texts reject the connection of *brahma* with names and forms that are the product of avidyā (nescience) and speak of brahma in negative expressions such as 'asthūla' (not gross or big), there it is parabrahma (that is meant), but where in such passages as 'He is mind, has prāṇa or body, the form of light, whose thoughts are true, whose nature is like ākāśa (present everywhere), who creates everything' &c, brahma is mentioned for worship and it is *apara*.[2456]

2455. बाष्कलिना च बाध्वः पृष्टः सन्नवचनेनैव ब्रह्म प्रोवाचेति श्रूयते। 'स होवाचाधीहि भो इति स तूष्णीं बभूव तं ह द्वितीये वा तृतीये वा वचन उवाच ब्रूमः खलु त्वं तु न विजानासि। उपशान्तोऽयमात्मा' इति। शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. III. 2. 17. This is a Vedic Text acc. to Śaṅkara, but it has not yet been identified.

2456. किं पुनः परं ब्रह्म किमपरमिति। उच्यते। यत्राविद्याकृतनामरूपादिविशेषप्रतिषेधादस्थूलादिशब्दैर्ब्रह्मोपदिश्यते तत्परम्। तदेव यत्र नामरूपादिविशेषेण केनचिद्विशिष्टमुपासनायोपदिश्यते 'मनोमयः प्राणशरीरो भारूपः' (छा. III. 14. 2) इत्यादिशब्दैस्तदपरम्। भाष्य on वे. सू. IV. 3. 14; एवमेकमपि ब्रह्मापेक्षितोपाधिसम्बन्धं निरस्तोपाधिसम्बन्धं चोपास्यत्वेन ज्ञेयत्वेन च वेदान्तेषूपदिश्यत इति। शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू. I. 1. 12. It should be noted that the words 'neti neti' occur four times in the great exposition of Yājñavalkya on brahman in Bṛ. Up. IV. 2. 4, IV. 4. 22, IV. 5. 15, III. 9. 26. The highest brahman is conceived as beyond space, time and independent of the law of causality. We may compare the conceptions of *para-brahma* and *apara-brahma* with what Plato postulates (in Timaeus, Introduction p. 6 to Bury's translation) as the distinction between Being and Becoming viz. Being is changeless, eternal, self-existent and apprehensible by thought only; Becoming is the opposite, ever changing, never truly existent and the object of sensations, and the perceptible universe belongs to the latter.

The description of the creation of the universe and its dissolution are valid only on the practical plane. In *Advaita* Vedānta, Sattā (reality) is said to be of three kinds, viz. Pāramārthikī (the highest, the absolute), vyāvahārikī (of practical life) and prātibhāsikī (apparent or illusory). The first is the province of parā-vidyā which teaches that only the Ātman exists, that the cosmos exists within the Ātman and nothing else has intrinsic reality apart from it. From this high metaphysical standpoint there is in reality no creation nor dissolution, the individual self is not really in bondage, therefore none is liberated. The 2nd kind of reality is empirical and practical and the dogmas of the creation and dissolution of the world, of the individual self, its bondage, transmigaration and final liberation are valid only for the *aparā-vidyā*. Most religions postulate three fundamental entities viz God, individual self and the external world. These three are true but only up to a certain limit (only so long as a man holds his own ego as a separate reality) but these three are not the ultimate Truth. Even in this lower kind of reality, a man who is in deep sleep becomes (for a time) united with (or absorbed in) the True as stated by the Chān. Up. VI. 8. 1 (yatraitat puruṣaḥ svapiti nāma satā somya tadā sampanno bhavati). The third kind of reality pertains to dream state. One may have experience of pleasure and pain and misery from what one sees in a dream, which are real as long as the dream lasts, but all this that is seen in a dream vanishes the moment the man is awake. As stated above (p. 1485 and note 2434) the descriptions of the creation of the world have only this in view that there is non-difference between cause and effect and that they all lead to a correct understanding about *brahman*. Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. II. 3. 30 extends the same reasoning to individual selves (to be quoted later on under 'Karma and transmigration').

In the Upaniṣads there is apparent discrepancy as regards what was created and the order of the things[2457] created. The

2457. It may be noted that the creation of the universe is put in the Upaniṣads in the distant and dim past, not at a definite date as fixed by Biblical chronology (4004 B. C.). Vide Pringle-Pattison in 'Idea of God' (ed. of 1917) p. 299: H. D. Anthony in 'Science and its background' (MacMillan, 1948, p. 2) states that James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, in the 17th century introduced into the Anglican Church the year 4004 B.C. as the date of creation. On the medieval Christian doctrine, creation is only an incident in God's existence and man is made in the image of God and it is by the breath of God that man became a living soul (Genesis I. 27 and II. 7). There is another point that distinguishes Christian doctrine about man from the Vedānta doctrine; according to the former man is conceived and born in sin, according to the latter the human soul is divine.

Bṛ. Up. (V. 5. 1) states 'in the beginning there were only waters; the waters created *satya*, which is *brahma*, brahman created Prajāpati, who created the gods'. In Chān. Up. VI. 2. 3 the thing expressly mentioned as the first creation is *tejas* (heat), ākāśa not being mentioned at all, while in the Tai. Up. II. 1 ākāśa is said to have been first created and then Vāyu (was created from ākāśa), then Agni from Vāyu. Similarly, in the Chān. Up. IV. 2 where the creation of *tejas*, waters and food (i. e. the earth) is expressly mentioned, nothing is said about the creation of Vāyu, which is set out in Tai. Up. II. I. This matter about the creation of the elements and their order is discussed in V. S. II. 3. 1-11. The reply of Śaṅkarācārya is that a *Śruti* passage like the one in Ch. Up. is concerned only with the creation of some elements like *tejas* and cannot be also interpreted as having a second purpose, viz. showing that the creation of ākāśa in Tai. Up. is wrong and should be discarded.[2458]

On the subject of creation, the question arises whether the individual Self is also a creation like that of the earth, trees and shrubs. The Upaniṣads have a good deal to say on this. Here also two kinds of texts have to be considered. In the first place, some texts seem to state that the individual selves spring from the Supreme Spirit. A few passages that are sometimes relied upon for this last matter may be cited here.[2459] The Bṛ. Up. states 'just as tiny sparks spring forth from fire, in the same way from this Ātman spring up all prāṇas, all worlds, all gods and all creatures'. The Muṇḍaka Up. expands this same idea as follows: As from a well-kindled fire sparks of the same nature spring forth in thousands, so from the Imperishable various living beings issue and return into it. The Smṛti of Yāj. cites the same illustration of fire and sparks. Another and perhaps apter illustration is in the Kaṭha Up. 'just as pure water poured in (other) pure water becomes like it (i. e. not distingui-

2458. न ह्यीयं श्रुतिस्तेजोजनिप्रधाना सती श्रुत्यन्तरप्रसिद्धामाकाशस्योत्पत्तिं वारयितुं शक्नोति, एकस्य वाक्यस्य व्यापारद्वयासम्भवात्। भाष्य on वे. सू. II. 3. 6.

2459. यथाग्नेः क्षुद्रा विस्फुलिङ्गा व्युच्चरन्त्येवमेवास्मादात्मनः सर्वे प्राणाः सर्वे लोकाः सर्वे देवाः सर्वाणि भूतानि व्युच्चरन्ति। बृह. उप. II. 1. 20; यथा सुदीप्तात्पावकाद्विस्फुलिङ्गाः सहस्रशः प्रभवन्ते सरूपाः। तथाक्षराद्विविधाः सोम्य भावाः प्रजायन्ते तत्र चैवापियन्ति। मुण्डकोप॰ II. 1. 1. Compare कौषीतक्युप॰ 'यथाग्नेर्ज्वलतः सर्वा दिशो विस्फुलिङ्गा विप्रतिष्ठेरन्नेवमेवैतस्मादात्मनः प्राणा यथायतनं विप्रतिष्ठन्ते। प्राणेभ्यो देवा देवेभ्यो लोकाः। IV. 18 and also मैत्री VI. 26 and 31 for a similar verse. याज्ञ. III. 67 is निःसरन्ति यथा लोहपिण्डात्तप्तात्स्फुलिङ्गकाः। सकाशादात्मनस्तद्वदात्मानः प्रभवन्ति हि॥; यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेव भवति। एवं मुनेर्विजानत आत्मा भवति गौतम॥ कठोप॰ IV. 15.

shable), so the self of the wise sage becomes (indistinguishable from the Supreme Essence). On the other hand, there are numerous Upaniṣad[2460] passages which categorically state that the individual self is unborn, undying, is not a product, that the Supreme Spirit enters as individual self, that there is non-difference between the one Supreme Spirit and the individual self. Some of these passages are set out in the note below. All those passages are cited by Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. II. 3. 17, which states two propositions viz. the individual self is unproduced and that it is eternal according to Śruti passages (nātmāśruter-nityatvācca tābhyaḥ). How the one Supreme Spirit expands into and pervades the manifold universe of plurality is a great mystery and can only be explained by illustrations. The few passages in which the texts seem to mention the creation or dissolution of individual selves are to be understood as referring to the Upādhis (such as body and mind) by which the self is affected. Yājñavalkya gives this answer in finally winding up his exposition to Maitreyī[2461] 'this self is imperishable and indestructible; but (when one speaks of death what is meant is) that the self has no longer any contact with material elements'. The Śāntiparva[2462] and the Gītā (II. 20, 21, 24, 25) say the same thing.

The highest metaphysical standpoint can be realized by only a few. For millions of men, the empirical standpoint alone remains and it is for them that texts speak of a personal God, ritual and sacrifices; they are only on the first rung of the ladder

---

2460. जीवापेतं वाव किलेदं म्रियते न जीवो म्रियत इति । छा. उप. I. 11. 3; स वा एष महानज आत्माऽजरोऽमरोऽमृतोऽभयो ब्रह्म । (बृह. IV. 4 25); न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चित्... अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणो न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे । कठ 2. 18; तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत् । तै. उप. II. 6 ; अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि । छा. उप. VI. 3. 2 ; स एष इह प्रविष्ट आ नखाग्रेभ्यः । बृह. I. 4. 7 ; तत्त्वमसि (छा. उप. VI. 8. 7); अहं ब्रह्मास्मि (बृ. उप. I. 4. 10); अयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूः । बृह. उप. II. 5-19.

2461. अविनाशी वा अरे आत्मानुच्छित्तिधर्मा मात्रासंसर्गस्त्वस्य भवति । बृह. उप. IV. 5. 14. This is quoted by शङ्कराचार्य on वे. सू II. 3. 17.

2462. न जीवनाशोऽस्ति हि देहभेदे मिथ्यैतदाहुर्मृत इत्यबुद्धाः । जीवस्तु देहान्तरितः प्रयाति दशार्धतैवास्य शरीरभेदः ॥ एवं सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढश्चरति संवृतः । दृश्यते त्वग्र्यया बुद्ध्या सूक्ष्मया तत्त्वदर्शिभिः ॥ तं पूर्वापररात्रेषु युञ्जानः सततं बुधः । लघ्वाहारो विशुद्धात्मा पश्यत्यात्मानमात्मनि । शान्ति 180. 26-28 (=187. 27-29 Ch. ed.). दशार्ध means five and दशार्धता means पञ्चत्व. With न जीवनाशोऽस्ति compare छा. उप. VII. 11. 3 जीवापेतं वाव किलेदं म्रियते न जीवो म्रियत इति and the verse एवं सर्वेषु भूतेषु is almost the same as कठ. III. 12 एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोत्मा न प्रकाशते । दृश्यते त्वग्र्यया बुद्ध्या सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः ॥. The verse एवं सर्वेषु ... दर्शिभिः occurs again in शान्ति chap. 246. 5 (=cr. ed. 238. 5).

to enlightenment and are only dimly aware of God; there is a much smaller class of people other than the preceding, who pray, seek God and come to realize that God is both immanent and transcendent; there is a third class of a very few people, the great sages and masters, the spiritual elite such as Śaṅkarācārya. who reach the peak of pure monism, who lose the sense of the ego and who are ripe for entering into union with the One and they cannot and should not say that the individual soul and the physical world are all unreal (or Māyā). Both Bādarāyaṇa (V. S. II. 2. 29 'Vaidharmyāc-ca na svapnādivat') and Śaṅkarācārya are agreed that the ordinary physical world is entirely different from dreams and that the impressions in the waking state are not independent of existing objects. Apart from the question whether the word 'Māyā' used in V. S. III. 2. 3 (Māyāmātram tu &c.) is used by Bādarāyaṇa in the sense in which Śaṅkarācārya understands it, it cannot be denied that Upaniṣad passages like Kaṭha Up. II. 4. 2, Praśna I, 16, Chān. Up. VIII. 3. 1-2, the prayer in Bṛ. Up. I. 3. 28 (asato mā sadgamaya &c) could easily suggest the doctrine of Māyā and lead to it as an intelligible development. Hence the proper language for almost all men is not to speak about the world as Māyā (illusion). If the individual soul and the world are unreal, then it may be argued by one who does not subscribe to the doctrine of Māyā as against those who hold it that you are teaching that an unreal soul has to escape from an unreal *Samsāra* and secure what you call mokṣa by means which are themselves unreal (such as Upaniṣad study) and that therefore mokṣa itself is unreal. How the one Reality becomes many and expresses itself in the ever-changing physical world is really an inexplicable mystery, but that does not entitle all of us to say that the world is unreal or a dream. The few highly philosophical men may say that what is real is the one Absolute, that all else is only an appearance of that Absolute. Common men may, however, complain that explanations offered by these philosophers do not satisfy them or are beyond them.

When one has to emphasize what the Reality behind the world is in itself, one speaks of the Absolute *brahman*, but when one has to speak about the relation of the one Reality to the individual selves and the physical world one speaks of a personal God. When the Vedāntasūtra (II. 1. 14) states[2463] that the

---

2463. On तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः (वे. सू. II. 1. 14) शङ्कराचार्य says 'प्राक् चात्मैकत्वावगतेरव्याहतः सर्वः सत्यानृतव्यवहारो लौकिको वैदिकश्चेत्यवोचाम'।; सर्वज्ञ-

(*Continued on next page*)

world is non-different (*ananya*) from *brahman*, what is meant is not that the two are identical, but only this that the selves and the world are not entirely different from *brahman*. When it is said that *Mokṣa* results if one realizes *brahman*, there is no question of the destruction of the world but all that it comes to is that the false idea or outlook in that case is displaced or sublated by a true one. How the finite world arises from the Infinite is a mystery, for which Śaṅkarācārya employs the word 'Māyā'. But he is positive that till a person realizes the one Ātman all religious and worldly courses of life, real-unreal, go on unobstructed. The concept of Māyā as postulated by Śaṅkarācārya (on V. S. II. 1. 14 and other places) is one of the most misunderstood elements of Vedānta. Further, it should not be forgotten that a very large number of philosophically minded Hindus do not advocate the doctrine that the world is an illusion; all that is said by advaitins is that the world is not as real as the Absolute is. The passages quoted below from Śaṅkarācārya's *Bhāṣya* clarify his position, which is this. There is the physical world with its manifold distinctions, but it must rest on something else; that something is called the *absolute brahman*. The relation between the two is inexplicable and therefore it is spoken of as Māyā. In that way Śaṅkarācārya is agnostic, while other religious philosophers are not willing to admit the futility of theories or their helplessness to put forward a generally acceptable and reasonable theory of the relation of the universe and the Eternal Spirit behind it.

It should not be forgotten that, according to our śāstras the goals of human life are four, *Dharma* (an ethical life of doing what is right), *Artha* (a life of acquisition of wealth i. e. economic life based on justice), *Kāma* (a life of the enjoyment of innocent pleasures and right desires) and *Mokṣa* (liberation), this last being the highest goal to be attained only by a few people (it is called *Paramapuruṣārtha*). Even in the Ṛgveda (I. 89. 8) the sage prays for physical health,[2464] happiness and

---

(*Continued from last page*)

स्येश्वरस्यात्मभूते इवाविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य माया शक्तिः प्रकृतिरिति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलप्येते ।, तदेवमविद्यात्मकोपाधिपरिच्छेदापेक्षमेवेश्वरस्येश्वरत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वशक्तित्वं च न परमार्थतो विद्ययापास्तसर्वोपाधिस्वरूपे आत्मनीशित्रीशितव्यसर्वज्ञादिव्यवहार उपपद्यते ।' वाचस्पतिमिश्र in the भामती on वे. सू. II. 1. 14 makes the laconic remark 'न खल्वनन्यत्वमित्यभेदं ब्रूमः किन्तु भेदं व्यासेधामः'.

2464. भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयाम देवा भद्रं पश्येमाक्षभिर्यजत्राः । स्थिरैरङ्गैस्तुष्टुवांसस्तनूभिर्व्यशेम देवहितं यदायुः ॥ ऋ. I. 89. 8 = वाज. सं. 25. 21.

a life of hundred years in the words "O Gods, may we be able to hear words of welfare (i. e. we may not suffer deafness till our death), may we see with our eyes pleasing sights, may we, engaged in praising you and possessing strong limbs and bodies, enjoy (long) life as fixed by God (i. e. 100, 116 or 120 years)'. Vide also Ṛg. VII. 66. 16. The Manusmṛti, after referring to several views about the number of the goals of human life, states its own final conclusion (in II. 224) that there are three goals[2465] (Dharma, Artha and Kāma) for all men and condemns premature resort to sannyāsa in the following words (VI. 36-37) "Having studied the Vedas as laid down in śāstras, having produced sons and having performed sacrifices according to one's ability, one should fix his mind on *Mokṣa* (liberation); if a man desires Mokṣa without having performed these duties he falls into hell'. Manu emphasizes that a man must discharge his duties (i. e. pay off the three debts) as laid down in Tai. S. VI. 3. 10. 5 (quoted in H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 270 n. 621) before he can renounce the world. The experience of sexual life and other pleasures not opposed to righteousness was not condemned by Manu and other Śāstras and in the Bhagavadgītā (VII. 11) Lord Kṛṣṇa identifies himself with Kāma that is not in opposition to righteousness. In the three goals[2466] of ordinary human life there is hardly anything that should cause surprise. The Gītā demands a life dedicated to active work and regards doing one's duty as worship (III. 8, 19, 20, 25, IV. 18, XVIII. 65-66). The 4th goal (mokṣa) is in a way opposed to the first three. But the first three goals enable a man to attain liberation, after he has discharged his duties. It was not meant for everybody but only for a selected few.

The 4th goal can be attained only by a few men. The theory in the Upaniṣads is that in order to secure correct knowledge of the Self, Reality behind everything, the study of the Veda, sacrifices, charity, austerities and fasts are necessary

---

2465. For the three views about the four āśramas, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 424-425.

2466. तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसाऽनाशकेन। बृह. उप. IV. 4. 22; तस्मादेवंविच्छान्तो दान्त उपरतस्तितिक्षुः समाहितो भूत्वात्मन्येवात्मानं पश्यति। सर्वमात्मानं पश्यति ... विपापो विरजोऽविचिकित्सो ब्राह्मणो भवति। एष ब्रह्मलोकः सम्राट्। एनं प्रापितोऽसीति होवाच याज्ञवल्क्यः। बृह. उप. IV. 4. 23. These two passages of Bṛ. Up. are the basis of वे. सू. III. 4. 26-27.

as preparation (Br. Up. IV. 4. 22). Because the Upaniṣads often employ the words "Brahma veda brahmaiva bhavati" (as in Muṇḍaka III 2. 9) one should not run away with the idea that *mere knowledge* of *brahma* (from books or a teacher) is enough. Though the verb "vid" (to know) is employed, the Upaniṣads are emphatic that before one attains realization of *brahma* one must have lived a life of detachment, peace, self-restraint etc. For example, in Br. Up. IV. 4. 23 Yājñavalkya says to Janaka "Therefore, one who knows this (under tarka quoted above p. 1478) evil does not overcome him, he overcomes all evil and hence he becomes free from evil, free from *rajas* (desires), free from doubts, he becomes a (true) Brāhmaṇa. This is the Brahma-world. O king! you have been made to reach the world. So said Yājñavalkya." This passage clearly emphasizes three stages, firstly, verbal knowledge about *brahma* (evam-vid), secondly he becomes *śānta*, *dānta* &c., thirdly, he realizes the non-difference of himself and the world from the Supreme Self. In this text the indeclinable past participle [2467] (bhūtvā) in "tvā", acc. to Pāṇini III. 4. 21, is used and so clearly conveys that (as Sanskrit grammar and usage require), in order that a person may realize the Self in his own self, he must have been already endowed with all that precedes the word "bhūtvā".

Similarly, in the Muṇḍakopaniṣad it is provided [2467a] 'After carefully examining all the worlds that are collected (gained or brought about) by actions, a brāhmaṇa should reach a sense of disgust or disregard with the thought that by actions (which are all impermanent) nothing that is imperishable (lit. unmade) can be attained, he should, for the special understanding of that, approach with fuel in hand a teacher who is learned in the Veda and who solely dwells in *brahman*, that wise (guru) declared *brahma-vidyā* to the one who thus properly (respectfully) approaches and whose mind is quiescent (not perturbed by vanity &c.) and whose mind has ceased to hanker after objects of sense, whereby the disciple would realize the immutable Reality, the Puruṣa (Self).' Here also the word "parīkṣya" shows that

---

2467. Vide Śabara on Jaimini X. 3. 48 'ktvā tāvat pūrvakāla eva smaryate.'

2467a. परीक्ष्य लोकान्कर्मचितान् ब्राह्मणो निर्वेदमायान्नास्त्यकृतः कृतेन। तद्विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत् समित्पाणिः श्रोत्रियं ब्रह्मनिष्ठम्॥ तस्मै स विद्वानुपसन्नाय सम्यक् प्रशान्तचित्ताय शमान्विताय। येनाक्षरं पुरुषं वेद सत्यं प्रोवाच तां तत्त्वतो ब्रह्मविद्याम्॥ मुण्डकोप I. 2. 12-13; नाविरतो दुश्चरितान्नाशान्तो नासमाहितः। नाशा...मसो वापि प्रज्ञानेनैनमाप्नुयात्॥ कठ 2. 24.

brahmavidyā can be attained only by him who already has become tired of the world of senses. It is further provided that[2468] when a man becomes freed from all hankerings that cling to the heart of man, he becomes immortal and attains *brahma* in this very life. The Bṛ. Up. (iv. 4. 6) states that of him who does not desire, who, not desiring, is freed from desires, who feels that he has obtained all desires in that he desires only the Self, the life breaths do not depart towards higher worlds (heaven etc.) as he, being (in reality) *brahma* only, becomes absorbed in *brahma*.

The Kaṭha Up. (2. 24) remarks 'He, who had not ceased from evil conduct, whose mind is not serene, who does not practise concentration, would not be able by mere knowledge to find the Ātman.'

The unalloyed Upaniṣad doctrine appears to be that, even when a man does good actions, they produce good results, to enjoy which the soul would have to undergo the bondage of fresh good births and thus liberation will be put off. Therefore, complete renunciation of all actions and their rewards was inculcated for the sannyāsin, who was to give up all desires for wealth, progeny and higher worlds and beg for alms as long as the body lasts. As no other course of conduct for the sannyāsin is specified here, it would have to be deemed that the Upaniṣad teaches only this mode of life for the sannyāsin. This view is further strengthened by other passages of the Upaniṣads, where it is said that the liberated are beyond sukṛta (good deeds and their consequences) and duṣkṛta (evil deeds and their consequences). The Chāndgoya says[2469] "the self is a bank (a dike or ridge) so that these worlds are kept asunder and are not confounded, day and night do not pass beyond (over) bank, nor old age, death and misery, neither good deeds nor evil deeds; all evil deeds turn away from him, for the world of *brahma* is free from all evil'. Similarly, the Kauṣītaki Up. says "being freed from good actions and from evil ones, this knower of brahma moves towards brahma (i. e. becomes one with or is absorbed in brahma)'.

2468. यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः। अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते॥ कठोप. VI. 14 and बृह. उप. IV. 4. 7 (which latter quotes it as a śloka).

2469. अथ य आत्मा स सेतुर्विधृतिरेषां लोकानामसम्भेदाय। नैतं सेतुमहोरात्रे तरतो न जरा न मृत्युर्न शोको न सुकृतं न दुष्कृतम्। सर्वे पाप्मानोऽतो निवर्तन्ते। अपहतपाप्मा ह्येष ब्रह्मलोकः। छा. उप. VIII. 4. 1; स एष विसुकृतो विदुष्कृतो ब्रह्म विद्वान्ब्रह्मैवाभिप्रैति। कौषी. उप. I. 4.

In this way the Upaniṣads appear to inculcate that the sannyāsin should completely give up all actions except living till the body lasts. The Jābālopaniṣad[2470] (4) provides that the very day on which a person becomes disgusted (with worldly life) he should become a wandering ascetic (a sannyāsin). This emphasizes that not mere knowledge but disgust with worldly life is necessary before one becomes a sannyāsin. Vide Kaṭhopaniṣad (II. 24) quoted above in note 2467a. The Praśnopaniṣad emphasizes 'to them alone comes the pure world of *brahman*, in whom there is no crookedness, no untruth and no duplicity' (I. 16). The Upaniṣads sometimes do say that 'one who knows *brahma* becomes *brahma* itself' (Muṇḍaka II. 3. 9), but the same Upaniṣads (e. g. Muṇḍaka I. 2. 12-13 quoted in n. 2467a) require great moral and spiritual attainments besides mere knowlegde of *brahma*.

It is not necessary to set out more Upaniṣad passages to exhibit the proper relation between mere knowledge of *brahma* and Realization of brahma.[2471]

In classical Sanskrit several words are employed to describe the state of liberation. The Amarakośa regards mukti, kaivalya, nirvāṇa, śreyas, niḥśreyasa, amṛta, mokṣa and apavarga as synonyms. Mukti, mokṣa, and amṛta (or amṛtatva) are frequently employed in the Upaniṣads and the Gītā. They refer to the state of Salvation or Liberation from different points of view. Man is liable to have hankerings and to birth and death; therefore when the soul becomes free from that cycle and realizes *brahma* it is said that he becomes immortal or secures immortality. Vide Bṛ. Up. VI. 4. 7 and 14, V. 15–17 (Vidyayāmṛtamaśnute), Chān. Up. II. 23. 2 (he who is firmly grounded in brahma attains immortality), Kaṭha Up. VI. 2 and 9, Śvet. Up.

2470. यदहरेव विरजेत्तदहरेव प्रव्रजेत्। जाबालोप० 4. नाविरतो दुश्चरितान्नाशान्तो नासमाहितः। नाशान्तमानसो वापि प्रज्ञानेनैनमाप्नुयात्। कठोप. II. 24; तेषामसौ विरजो ब्रह्मलोको न येषु जिह्ममनृतं न माया चेति। प्रश्नोप. I. 16.

2471. So much had to be said because Frof, Edgerton in his paper 'Dominant ideas in the formation of Indian culture' in J. A. O. S. Vol. 62 (for 1942) pp. 151–156 appears to suggest that the Upaniṣads carry forward the idea of the Atharvaveda that knowledge of a matter was supposed to have magic power. It is not possible for limitations of space to examine his arguments at length. With great respect for such a veteran scholar, it has to be said that, so far as the Upaniṣads are concerned, mere knowledge of brahma is only a first step, and that one who desires liberation has to live life on a high moral and spiritual level. Vide Gītā XIII. 7–11 for definition of jñāna.

IV. 17 and 20, III. 1, 10, 13, Gītā 13. 12, 14. 20. Mukti and mokṣa are both derived from the root 'muc' (to be free) and the verbal forms of '*muc*' are frequently used along with 'immortality' as in Kaṭha Up. VI. 8 (yam jñātvā mucyate jantur-amṛtatvam ca gacchati) and 14, Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 7, Śv. Up. I. 8 and IV. 16 (jñātvā devaṁ mucyate sarvapāśaiḥ). The word mokṣa occurs in Śv. Up. IV. 16 and Gītā 5. 28, 7. 29, 18. 30. Niḥśreyasa (moksa, than which there is nothing better) occurs in Kauṣ. Up. III. 2, Gītā V. 2. Vide p. 1037 n 671 for 'niḥśreyasa'. The word 'śreyas' often means 'better' in the Upaniṣads (Tai. Up. I. 11 and Chān. Up. IV. 6. 5) and Gītā II. 7, 31, III. 35, XVIII. 47 &c., but in Kaṭha Up. II. 1 and 2 śreyas (as opposed to *preyas* i. e. pleasure) really means 'niḥśreyasa' (salvation).[2472] Kaivalya does not occur in the principal Upaniṣads, but *kevalaḥ* (not affected by guṇas or isolated as pure consciousness) occurs in Śv. Up. IV. 18 and VI. 11 (sākṣī cetā kevalo nirguṇaśca) Nirvāṇa occurs in Gītā VI. 15 (the yogin, that has subdued his mind and always practises yoga, secures peace, centred on me that is highest nirvāṇa); in Gītā II. 72 and V. 24–25 we find 'brahmanirvāṇam' which means 'bliss in brahma'. Apavarga occurs only in the Maitri Upaniṣad VI. 30 and was the goal laid down by the very first sūtra of the Nyāyadarśana.

It should be noted that cosmology whether in the Upaniṣads or later works is based on the geocentric theory and is concerned mostly with the earth, the elements, the Sun, Moon, planets and stars in general (without details).

The Manusmṛti has several theories on creation. In I. 5–19 we have the first theory: this (universe) existed in the form of darkness, was unperceived, destitute of distinctive signs, not subject to reasoning, unknowable, immersed in deep sleep as it were. Then the divine Self-existent appeared with irresistible power, dispelling darkness and making all this including the great elements discernible; he shone forth of his own (will); he, desirous of producing beings of various types from his body, first produced water only after reflecting (over the idea of creating) and planted therein his seed; the seed became a golden egg, equal in brilliance to the sun and in that egg he himself was born as Brahmā, the progenitor of the whole

---

2472. निःश्रेयस is one of twenty-five words mentioned by Pāṇini in V. 4. 77 as irregular and the Mahābhāṣya explains it as निश्चितं श्रेयः.

world. He is called Nārāyaṇa,[2473] since waters, designated as *nārās* (offspring of Nara), were his first place of residence. From that first cause, not yet unfolded, which can neither be called *sat* nor *asat*, was produced a *puruṣa* (a male) who is called by people Brahmā. In that egg the divine one resided for one year; he divided the egg into two parts after reflecting on that matter; out of those two halves (of the egg) he created heaven and earth, between these two middle region, the eight directions and the abode of waters (the sea). From himself he drew forth mind which is neither *sat* nor *asat*, from mind Ahaṅkāra (self-consciousness), and the *mahat*-ātman, all products produced by the combinations of three guṇas, the five organs of sense which perceive the objects of sense; He created all beings by joining the subtle particles of the six (ahaṅkāra and tanmātrās) with portions of himself, the five great elements enter the framer of all beings. This theory combines the ideas contained in Ṛg. X. 129 (particularly verses 1-3) with those in the Śat. Br. XI. 1. 6. 1 and Chān. Up. III. 19. 1-2 (about the golden egg) and with the Sāṅkhya theory of *tattvas* and *guṇas*, though Manu differs from the standard Sāṅkhya of the Kārikā as regards the order in which Mahat, Ahaṅkāra and the five subtle elements arise. In I. 21 Manu states[2474] that Hiraṇyagarbha in the

---

2473. आपो नारा इति प्रोक्ता आपो वै नरसूनवः। ता यदस्यायनं पूर्वं तेन नारायणः स्मृतः॥ मनु I. 10. शान्तिपर्व 342. 40 (=cr. ed. 328. 35) has first half and the 2nd half is अयनं मम तत्पूर्वमतो नारायणो ह्ययम्; विष्णुपु. I, 4. 5-6, ब्रह्माण्ड I. 5.5-6, कूर्म I. 6. 4-5 इमं चोदाहरन्त्यत्र श्लोकं नारायणं प्रति। ... आपो नारा...सूनवः। अयनं तस्य ताः पूर्वं ... स्मृतः. It is obvious that the two Purāṇas borrow from some work probably from मनु. मार्कण्डेयपु. 44. 4-5 (Venk. ed,) has the same verses as विष्णुपु. viz. इमं चोदा° and आपो ... सूनवः। तासु शेते स यस्माच्च तेन नारायणः स्मृतः॥; वराहपु. 2. 25-26 are the same as विष्णुपु. I 4. 5-6. ब्रह्मपु. (I. 38-39) has आपो नारा ... सूनवः। अयनं तस्य ता ... स्मृतः॥.

2474. सर्वेषां तु स नामानि कर्माणि च पृथक् पृथक्। वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ पृथक्संस्थाश्च निर्ममे॥ मनु. I. 21. The वे. सू. I. 3. 28 is 'शब्द इति चेन्नातः प्रभवात्प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम्. On this the bhāṣya is "कथं पुनरवगम्यते शब्दात्प्रभवति जगदिति। प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम्' प्रत्यक्षं श्रुतिः प्रामाण्यं प्रत्यनपेक्षत्वात्। अनुमानं स्मृतिः प्रामाण्यं प्रति सापेक्षत्वात्। ते हि शब्दपूर्वां सृष्टिं दर्शयतः। 'एते इति वै प्रजापतिर्देवानसृजत, असृग्रमिति मनुष्यान्, इन्दव इति पितॄन्, तिरः पवित्रमिति ग्रहान्, आशव इति स्तोत्रं विश्वानीति शस्त्रम्, अभिसौभगेत्यन्याः प्रजाः' इति श्रुतिः, ... स्मृतिरपि। अनादिनिधना नित्या वागुत्सृष्टा स्वयम्भुवा। आदौ वेदमयी दिव्या यतः सर्वाः प्रवृत्तयः। ... तथा। नामरूपं च भूतानां कर्मणां च प्रवर्तनम्। वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ निर्ममे स महेश्वरः॥ इति. The śruti text cited is Tāṇḍya-mahābrāhmaṇa VI. 9. 15, explains the words of Ṛg. IX. 62. 1, the mantra being 'एते असृग्रमिन्दवस्तिरः पवित्रमाशवः। विश्वान्यभि सौभगा॥'. The verse अनादिनिधना° is शान्तिपर्व 233. 24 (=cr. ed. 224. 55 which has only the first half) and the verse नामरूपं च occurs in विष्णुपुराण I. 5. 62, वायुपु. 9. 63 (reads प्रपञ्चनं) and कूर्म I. 7. 67-68 (reads प्राकृतानां प्रपञ्चनं).

beginning of creation assigned names, peculiar activities and conditions to all created beings by means of the words of Veda. In this it follows a śruti text (explaining Ṛg. IX. 62. 1) quoted by Śaṅkarācārya (on V. S. I. 3. 28) who quotes a verse in support from the Mahābhārata and another verse also (the source of which is not mentioned but which is found in some purāṇas).

Another theory of creation is stated in Manusmṛti I. 32-41. Brahmā divided his own body into two halves, one half a male and the other a female and from that female he created Virāj, who practised *tapas* and created a male who was no other than Manu (promulgator of Manusmṛti). Manu desirous of producing created beings, first created ten great sages as Prajāpatis, who created seven Manus, Gods, classes of gods, great sages, yaksas rākṣasas, gandharvas, apsarases, snakes, birds classes of pitṛs, lightning, clouds, large and small stars, monkeys, fishes, cattle, deer, men, lions, worms, insects, flies, immovable things (trees etc.). This account appears to be inspired by the Puruṣasūkta (Ṛg. X. 90), particularly verses 5, 8-10.

A third theory of creation by Brahmā after he awakes from his sleep is briefly noticed in Manusmṛti I. 74-78, viz. he creates (or appoints) his mind which impelled by Brahmā's desire to create, produces ākāśa (ether), of which sound is the (peculiar) quality; that ether modifying itself creates Vāyu possessing the quality of touch; from Vāyu arises refulgent light, from which arises water and from water arises the earth of which the special quality is smell. This theory is a modification of the Sāṅkhya doctrine, according to which (kārikā 25) all five elements proceed from *ahaṅkāra* and God Brahmā is thrown in (who has no place in standard Sāṅkhya). The Manusmṛti is in the habit of stating opposing views on the same topic one after another; e. g. note on the use of flesh in Manu V. 27-46 as compared with V. 48-56, Manu III. 13 as compared with III. 14-19 (on brāhmaṇa having a śūdra wife), Manu IX. 59-62 as opposed to IX. 64-68 on the practice of *Niyoga.*

Accounts of creation occur frequently in the Mahābhārata, mostly in the Śāntiparva. All cannot be set out here, but a few would be described. Chap. 175. 11-21 (=Ch. ed. 182. 11-21) states that from God known as *Avyakta* all beings were born, he first created mahān also called ākāśa, from ākāśa water was produced, from water were produced fire and vāyu, from the combination of these two the earth was produced. Then the

self-existent created a lotus, from which arose Brahmā, known as Ahaṅkāra and he produced the whole world. In chap. 176 (183 of Ch. ed.) it is stated that Brahmā first created water, from water arose Vāyu, from the combination of water and Vāyu arose Agni and earth was produced from the combination of Agni, Vāyu and ākāśa. Chap. 177 (=184, Ch. ed.) explains that the Mahābhūtas (great elements) are five viz. vāyu, ākāśa, agni, water and earth, that all bodies are made of these five, that there are five *indriyas*, five objects of sense and five qualities, śabda, sparśa (touch), rūpa (colour), rasa (taste) and gandha (smell); subdivisions of each of these five are mentioned. Chap. 178 (=189 of Ch. ed.) speaks of the five prāṇas and the spheres of their activities. Chap. 179-180 (=186-187 of Ch. ed.) deal with jīva (individual self) and states at the end that the body is perishable, that the self passes from one body to another and that by yoga one can see the self in the Highest Self. Chap. 200 (=207 Ch. ed.) states that Puruṣottama created the five elements, that he reclined on waters, that from his navel sprang a lotus brilliant like the sun, from which arose Brahmā, who created from his mind seven sons, Dakṣa, Marīci, Atri, Aṅgiras, Pulastya, Pulaha and Kratu. Dakṣa had many daughters (the eldest being Diti), from these daughters Daityas, Ādityas, the other gods, Kāla and its parts, the earth, the four varṇas, all kinds of men, Āndhras, Pulindas, Śabaras and others in Dakṣiṇāpatha and in the Uttarāpatha, Yauna (Yavanas), Kāmbojas, Gāndhāras, Kirātas, Barbaras and others were produced. Chap. 224 (=231 Ch. ed.) starts by saying that in the beginning there was *brahma*, beginningless and endless, unknowable and proceeds to divisions of time from *nimeṣa* to the yugas and their characteristics. Herein occur verses that are the same as in Manusmṛti I. 65-67, 69-70, 75-77, 81-83, 85-86. It is difficult to say who borrow as even the Manusmṛti (in X. 44) mentions Pauṇḍrakas, Oḍras, Draviḍas, Kāmbojas and Yavanas, Śakas, Pāradas, Pahlavas, Cīnas, Kirātas, Daradas and Khaśas, as having been originally sub-divisions or sub-castes of Kṣatriyas (Kṣatriya-jātayaḥ) but reduced to the position of śūdras, because of losing all contact with brāhmaṇas (X. 43) and because of the cessation of religious rites (like Upanayana &c.). In Śānti 311 (=cr. ed. 299) creation is described in Sāṅkhya terms with Brahmā thrown in. Brahmā (identified with *mahān*) was born in the golden egg, he remained inside the egg for a year, then he created within the two parts of the egg (heaven and earth), antarikṣa, from ahaṅkāra five elements were produced and their

five qualities are mentioned. Aśvamedhika (Chap. 40–42 is similar to Śānti 311) states the order of creation as avyakta–mahat-ahaṅkāra-five elements, the only peculiarity being that in verse 2 mahān is identified with Viṣṇu, Śambhu, buddhi and several other words are given as synonyms thereof.

The Smṛti of Yājñavalkya (III. 67–70) states that from the one Self, many individual selves arise just as from a red-hot iron ball sparks go out, that the unborn and imperishable Ātman is said to be born when connected with body, that in the beginning of creation, Paramātman creates the five elements, ether, vāyu, tejas, water and earth, each succeeding one possessing a rising series of qualities and when appearing as individual self, it receives (for body) the same elements. Then after pointing out how a human being is conceived, how the foetus grows in the womb and describing the anatomy (with number of bones, veins, arteries, muscles &c.) of the human body, the Smṛti avers that the whole world proceeds from the Paramātman and the individual self appears from the elements (which form the body). The individual self is beginningless[2475] and is not born, but it comes in intimate contact with a body that is due to acts influenced by false ideas, hankerings and aversions (III. 125). From the several parts (mouth, arms, thighs, feet &c) of the First Principle that assumes numerous forms arise the four varṇas in order, the earth, heaven, prāṇas, directions, Vāyu, Agni, Moon (from mind), the Sun (from His eye), sky and the whole movable and immovable world (III. 126–128). Here the Puruṣasūkta (Ṛg. X. 90. 1 and 12–14) is closely followed.

The Purāṇas devote thousands of verses to the theories of cosmology and cosmography. Only a very brief summary is all that can be attempted from the contents of a few among the extant Purāṇas that have been shown above to be the earliest, viz. Matsya, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu and Mārkaṇḍeya. It has been stated above (pp. 838–840) that the topics with which Purāṇas were deemed to be concerned were according to the Amarkośa five and that some of the Purāṇas themselves set out the five topics as creation (*sarga*), recreation after dissolution (*pratisarga*), dynasties (vaṁśa), the vast periods of time (called Manvantaras), and history and deeds of the descendants of the

---

2475. अनादिरात्मा कथितस्तस्यादिस्तु शारीरकम्। आत्मनस्तु जगत्सर्वं जगतश्चात्म-सम्भवः॥ या. III. 117.

solar, lunar and other dynasties (Vaṁśānucarita). Thus, many of the Purāṇas deal with creation at some length. A few striking theories and passages alone can be set out or cited.

The Matsyapurāṇa begins the topic of creation in the same way as the Manusmṛti does and some of the verses of the former are identical (or almost identical) with the verses of the Manusmṛti.[2476] The Matsya (2. 27) states; Nārāyaṇa alone appeared first and being desirous of creating the manifold world, produced from his body waters, cast the seed therein and a golden egg emerged; inside that egg the Sun appeared, he is called Āditya as well as Brahmā, he made the two halves of the egg into heaven and earth and produced all directions and the sky between the two (heaven and earth). Then the Meru and other mountains and the seven seas (of salt, sugarcane juice &c.) were produced. Nārāyaṇa became Prajāpati who created all this world including gods and asuras. The 3rd chap. of the Matsya speaks of the Vedas, Purāṇas and Vidyās as proceeding from his lips and states that he created from his mind ten sages, Marīci, Atri and others (3. 5–8). Then the Matsya launches on the Sāṅkhya scheme of creation (in 3. 14–29), stating that the three *guṇas* are *sattva*, *rajas*, *tamas*, and the state of their equilibrium is called *Prakṛti*, that some call it *Pradhāna*, others call it *Avyakta*, that this Pradhāna produces creation, that from the three guṇas rose Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśvara; that from Pradhāna arose Mahān, from the latter ahaṅkāra, then five Jñānendriyas and five Karmendriyas and the mind as the 11th sense and the five tanmātrās (subtle elements); that ākāśa was produced from the śabda-tanmātrā, vāyu from ākāśa, tejas from Vāyu and water from tejas, that the Puruṣa is the 25th *tattva*. Then the Matsya (3. 30–44) tells a fantastic story that Brahmā produced a woman (called Śatarūpā, Sāvitrī, Sarasvatī, Gāyatrī or Brahmāṇī) from himself, felt passion for her and had after a long time a son named Manu (called Svāyambhuva) and also Virāj from her; then Brahmā called upon his sons to create people. The Matsya in chapter four states that Brahmā had from Śatarūpā seven sons, Marīci and others (verses 25–26, contradicting chap. 3. 5–8), mentions two sons of Svāyambhuva Manu and also the descendants of those two sons. Some

2476. For example, Matsya 2. 25–27 and 32 echo the phraseology of Manu I. 5–6, 13, Matsya 2. 28 is the same as Manu I. 8, Matsya 3. 23 is same as Manu I. 75, Matsya 4. 55 (one half) is same as Manu IX. 129. The Brahmapurāṇa I. 37–39 are almost the same as Manu I. 6 and 8.

chapters from five onwards describe the descendants of Dakṣa, of Kaśyapa, of Diti, the coronation of Pṛthu, the solar and lunar dynastic and various classes of pitṛs.

The Vāyupurāṇa devotes five chapters (4–9) to creations of differents kinds (in over 600 verses). In Chap. 4 verses 22–61 the Sāṅkhya scheme of Pradhāna, Mahat, Ahaṅkāra, Tanmātrās is set out and is combined with the egg theory (verses 66ff). Chap. 6 appears to refer (verses 2–3) to the Puruṣasūkta (Ṛg. X. 90. 1–2), explains that Nārāyaṇa is so called because he reclines on waters, refers to the Boar incarnation, to nine kinds of creation, states a (different theory) that Brahmā created in the beginning the mind-born sons and Sanandana and Sanaka (6.65). Chapter 7 refers to re-creation, Chap. 8 (containing 198 verses) refers to the Yugas, their durations, the creation of eight Devayonis, of animals, metres &c., and different sons of Brahmā.

The Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa I (chapters 3–5) deal with the appearance of Hiraṇyagarbha and various kinds of creations and chapter 4 refers to Pradhāna, the guṇas and states that creation is due to the uneven mixture of guṇas that constitute Pradhāna but these work under Viṣṇu. Chap. 5 speaks of various kinds of creations, and the *mānasa* sons of Brahmā. Chapters 8, 11 of the Anuṣaṅgapāda (2nd section of the Purāṇa) deal with the creation of gods, pitṛs, men and of the great sages, Bhṛgu &c.

The first three chapters (containing about 240 verses) of the Brahmapurāṇa deal with creation. Chap. 1 (verses 34 ff) puts forward Brahmā as the creator of all *bhūtas* (beings) and as devotee of Nārāyaṇa and then states that ahaṅkāra arose from mahat and from ahaṅkāra the elements were produced. The Brahma like the Matsya closely follows (in I. 37-41) Manu I. 5-13. It refers to the creation of the seven sages Marīci, Atri and others who were seven Brahmāṇaḥ, the creation of Sādhyas, gods, the Ṛgveda and other Vedas, birds and all sorts of beings; it also states (I. 53) that Viṣṇu created Virāj, who created Puruṣa (this is based on the Puruṣasūkta (Ṛg. X. 90. 5) and that Puruṣa created people. Chapter 2 states that Puruṣa married Śatarūpā, that Puruṣa is called Svāyambhuva Manu, that a son Vīra was born to Puruṣa and Śatarūpā and Vīrā's two sons were Priyavrata and Uttānapāda; then their descendants are described, that Dakṣa had 50 daughters 10 of whom were married to Dharma, 13 to Kaśyapa and 27 (the nakṣatras) were

married to king Soma. Chapter 3 deals with the creation of gods and asuras.[2477]

The Viṣṇupurāṇa in Chapters 2, 4, 5, 7 of the first *aṁśa* deals with several kinds of creation. Chapter 2 starts with Viṣṇu and asserts that Pradhāna and Puruṣa are his forms and in verses 34-50 proclaims the details of the Sāṅkhya system and verse 54 refers to the production of the egg by Mahat and other tattvas. Chap. 3 deals with the question how *brahman*, which is free from guṇas, inconceivable, pure and untainted, is the author of creation, the reply being that there are natural powers (Śaktis) in all things that are inconceivable and so *brahman* has the power of creating the universe. Chap. 5 deals with nine kinds of creations viz. of Mahat, Tanmātrās. bhūtas, (elements), Vaikārika (i. e. Aindrīyaka), Mukhya (i. e. of immovable objects), of lower animals, of ūrdhvaretas (i. e. divine beings), of human beings, of Kumāras (i. e. Sanatkumāra and others).

The Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa in Chap. 42 speaks of the creation of Pradhāna, Mahat, Ahaṅkāra, Tanmātrās under the aegis of Brahmā. Chap. 44 speaks of the nine kinds of creation as in Viṣṇu. Chapters 45, 46, 47 deal with the creations of Gods, pitṛs, human beings, the four varṇas, beasts, birds, trees and plants &c. Passages from other Purāṇas need not and cannot be quoted as they are in the same strain as above and as limitations of space preclude further elaboration.

In the Upaniṣads the geographical details are very few and are limited to the territory between the Himālayas and Vindhya (the Kauṣitaki Up. II. 13 speaks of two parvatas, the north and south, the Bṛ. Up. 1. 1, 1–2 alludes to the eastern and western seas). Noble steeds were brought from Sindhu country (Bṛ. Up. VI. 1. 13), the country of Gandhāra (Chān. Up. VI. 14. 2) appears to

2477. As a sample of how several Purāṇas repeat the same verses, the following is set out: अव्यक्तं कारणं यत्तत्प्रधानमृषिसत्तमैः । प्रोच्यते प्रकृतिः सूक्ष्मा नित्यं सदसदात्मकम् ॥ ... त्रिगुणं तज्जगद्योनिरनादिप्रभवाप्ययम् । ... वेदवादविदो विद्वन्नियता ब्रह्मवादिनः । पठन्ति चैतमेवार्थं प्रधानप्रतिपादकम् । नाहो न रात्रिर्न नभो न भूमिर्नासीत्तमो ज्योतिरभूच्च नान्यत् । श्रोत्रादिबुद्ध्यानुपलभ्यमेकं प्राधानिकं ब्रह्म पुमांस्तदासीत् । विष्णोः स्वरूपात्परतोदिते द्वे रूपे प्रधानं पुरुषश्च विप्र । विष्णुपु. I. 2, 19, 21–24; ब्रह्माण्डपुराण I. 3, 1–9 'अव्यक्तकारणं ... दात्मकम् । प्रधानं प्रकृतिं चैव यमाहुस्तत्त्वचिन्तकाः ॥; the वायुपु. 4. 17 has अव्यक्तं कारणं यत्तु नित्यं सदसदात्मकम् । प्रधानं...तत्त्वचिन्तकाः ॥. The ब्रह्मपुराण 1.33 has अव्यक्तं कारणं ... त्मकम् । प्रधानं पुरुषस्तस्मान्निर्ममे विश्वमीश्वरः ॥. Mārkaṇḍeya, Chap. 42. 36–52 and 59–63 are identical almost word for word with Viṣṇu I. 2. 34–49, 51–55.

have been known and was at some distance from the place where the Upaniṣad was composed; the country Madra is mentioned in Bṛ. Up. III. 3. 1 and III 7. 1. Janaka was a king of Videha at whose court brāhmaṇas from Kurus, Pañcālya, gather together for argument with Yājñavalkya (Bṛ. Up. III 1. 1), king Ajātaśatru of Kāśī (Banaras) humbled the vain Bālāki Gārgya (Bṛ. Up. II. 1. 1), and Kauṣītaki IV. 1. 1, which latter mentions also the countries of Vaśa, Uśīnara, Kuru. Pañcāla and Videha); Kuru country occurs in Chān. Up. I. 10. 1. IV. 17. 10. Pañcāla country by itself in Chān. Up. V. 3. 1, Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 1; Aśvapat king of Kekaya (in the extreme North-west) imparted knowledge of Vaiśvānara-vidyā to brāhmaṇas.

The Purāṇas devote thousands of verses to cosmography [2478] i. e. description of the divisions of the earth called dvīpas, varṣas, the mountains, the oceans, the rivers and the countries therein and their extent, the motions of the sun, moon, planets, the yugas, manvantaras, and kalpas [2479] and Dharmaśāstra works frequently rely on them. Jambudvīpa was known at least before 300 B. C. as Aśoka mentions it in his Rūpanātha Rock Inscription, quoted above on p. 1016 n 1649. The word 'dvīpa' occurs in the Ṛgveda I. 169. 3 and VII. 20. 4 (vi *dvīpāni* pāpatan). Pāṇini derives the word from *dvi* and *āpaḥ*. (VI. 3. 97). A bare outline of these from some Purāṇas may be indicated here. The Matsyapurāṇa starts by saying (in chap. 113. 4-5) that there are thousands of dvīpas, but as it is not possible to describe the whole of the world in order it would expound only the seven [2480] dvīpas.

2478. The most systematic and complete work on the cosmography of ancient India as described in Purāṇas is W. Kirfel's 'Die Kosmographie der Inder' (Bonn, 1920, pp. 401) with plates. He deals with Purāṇa material in. pp. 1-177, with Buddhist material in pp. 178-207 and with Jaina material in pp. 208-339 and there is an index of proper names in pp. 340-401.

2479. Many of the Purāṇas contain the same questions put by the sages to the Sūta about the dvipas. ऋषय ऊचुः । कति द्वीपाः समुद्रा वा पर्वता वा कति प्रभो । कियन्ति चैव वर्षाणि तेषु नद्यश्च काः स्मृताः ॥ महाभूमिप्रमाणं च लोकालोकस्तथैव च । पर्यासिं परिमाणं च गतिश्चन्द्रार्कयोस्तथा । एतद् ब्रवीहि नः सर्वं विस्तरेण यथार्थवित् । त्वदुक्तमेतत्सकलं श्रोतुमिच्छामहे वयम् । सूत उवाच । द्वीपभेदसहस्राणि सप्त चान्तर्गतानि च । न शक्यन्ते क्रमेणेह वक्तुं वै सकलं जगत् ॥ सप्तैव तु प्रवक्ष्यामि चन्द्रादित्यग्रहैः सह ॥ मत्स्य. 113. 1-5, वायु 134. 1-3, 6-7, ब्रह्माण्ड II. 15. 2-3, 5-6, मार्कण्डेय 51. 1-3.

2480. The dvipas are generally said to be seven, but sometimes they are said to be 18 as in Vāyu 2. 15 (aṣṭādaśa samudrasya dvipān aśnan Purūravāḥ) and by Kālidāsa in Raghuvaṃśa VI. 38 (aṣṭādaśa-dvipa-nikhāta

(*Continued on next page*)

Chapters 121-123 of the same Purāṇa mention by name seven dvīpas viz. Jambudvīpa, Śakadvīpa, Kuśa, Krauñca, Śālmala, Gomedaka and Puskara, each succeeding one being double of each preceding one and each surrounded by a sea and each having seven *varṣas*, seven principal mountains, seven main rivers. The seven oceans surrounding the seven dvīpas are stated to be respectively of salt [2481] water, milk, liquid ghee, curds, liquor, sugar-cane juice, fresh water. The names and order of the dvīpas differ to some extent in different Purāṇas e. g. the Viṣṇu II. 1.12–14, II. 2.5, the Brahmapurāṇa (18.11) mention them as Plakṣa, Śālmala, Kuśa, Krauñca, Śāka and Puṣkara. The Vāyu (33. 11-14), Kūrma I. 45. 3, Mārk, 50, 18-20 mention the same seven in the same order.

The descriptions of Kalpa, Manvantara, Yuga in the Purāṇas have already been dealt with in H. of Dh. Vol. III. p. 890–91 and above pp. 686–693 and *pralaya* has been treated of in Vol. III pp. 893-895 and pp. 693-695 above. The Purāṇas contain thousands of verses on these topics.

The Viṣṇu (II. 2. 13-24) mentions the *varṣas* as Bhārata (the first among them), Kimpuruṣa, Hari, Ramyaka, Hiraṇmaya, Uttara-Kuru, Ilāvṛta, Bhadrāśva and Ketumāla. The Vāmana (*13. 2–5*) *mentions* the same except that it substitutes Campaka for Ramyaka. Viṣṇu II. (1. 16–17) states, however, that Nābhi, Kiṁpuruṣa, Harivarṣa, Ilāvṛta, Ramya, Hiraṇvat, Kuru, Bhadrāśva, Ketumāla were the names of nine kings, sons of Āgnīdhra, son of Priyavrata, a son of Svāyambhuva Manu and that the varṣas given to the nine sons of Āgnīdhra were respectively Himāhva (i. e. Bhārata), Hemakūṭa, Naiṣadha, Ilāvṛta, Nīlācala, Śveta, Śṛṅgavat, a varṣa to east of Meru, Gandhamādana. Thus there is a confusion of names of kings and names of *varṣas*. Vāyu (30. 38-40) states the same names of

---

(*Continued from last page*)

yūpaḥ). It is possible to take the word dvīpa in the sense of islands and not in the sense of continents in these cases. From Pāṇ. IV. 3. 10 (dvīpād-anusamudram yañ) it appears that the word 'dvīpa' was also used about islands near the sea coast. Vide 'Nine dvīpas of Bharatavarṣa' by Sashi bhushan Chauduri in I. A. Vol. 59 pp. 204–208 and 224–226.

2481. एते द्वीपाः समुद्रैस्तु सप्त सप्तभिरावृताः। लवणेक्षुसुरासर्पिर्दधिदुग्धजलैः समम्॥ विष्णु *II. 2. 6.* ब्रह्म. *18. 12,* मार्कं० *51. 7* (लवणे ... दधिक्षीरजलादिभिः) द्विगुणैर्द्विगुणैर्वृद्ध्या सर्वतः परिवेष्टिताः).

sons and in 33. 41–45 mentions the same varṣas except Mālya-vat, which was given to Bhadrāśva. [2482]

The Vāyu (45, 75-81) states that Bhāratavarṣa is to the north of the ocean and to the south of Himavat (Himālaya) and Manu was called Bharata because he supported his subjects and therefore this varṣa is called Bhārata. The Brahmāṇḍa (II. 16.7, says the same thing. The same (Vāyu) Purāṇa contradicts itself by stating (in 33. 50-52) that Nābhi's son was Ṛṣabha, whose son was Bharata after whom Bharata-varṣa is so called. Brahmāṇḍa (II. 14.60-62) says the same thing; Vāyu also stated (in 99. 134) that from Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā was born Bharata and Bhārata is so called [2483] after him. The seven

---

2482. उत्तरं यत्समुद्रस्य हिमाद्रेश्चैव दक्षिणम्। वर्षं तद्भारतं नाम भारती यत्र सन्ततिः॥ नवयोजनसाहस्रो विस्तारश्च द्विजोत्तमाः। कर्मभूमिरियं स्वर्गमपवर्गं च गच्छताम्॥ महेन्द्रो मलयः सह्यः शुक्तिमानृक्षपर्वतः। विन्ध्यश्च पारियात्रश्च सप्तात्र कुलपर्वताः॥ विष्णुपु. II. 3. 1–3, ब्रह्मपु. 19. 1–3; vide अग्नि 118. 1–3 (which reads हेमपर्वतः for ऋक्षपर्वतः), मार्कण्डेय (54. 10–11), ब्रह्माण्ड II. 16. 5 and 18–19. It is worthy of note that Pāṇini expressly names only Himavat (in IV. 4. 112) out of these mountains, though he knew other mountains like Kiṁśulukagiri and others (VI. 3. 117). अत्रापि भारतं श्रेष्ठं जम्बूद्वीपे महामुने। यतो हि कर्मभूरेषा यतोऽन्या भोगभूमयः॥ ब्रह्म. 19. 23, विष्णु. II. 3. 22. In both several verses after this are the same. भीष्मपर्व (chap. 9. 11 has the verse महेन्द्रो° (but reads ऋक्षवान्), while in chap. 6 (verses 4–5) only six are mentioned.

2483. The Viṣṇupurāṇa II. 1. 32 agrees with Vāyu 33. 50–52. In the Śākuntala (Act. VII.) Kālidāsa makes a character state that Śakuntalā's son called Sarvadamana in the hermitage of Kaṇva would become known as Bharata (इहायं सत्त्वानां प्रसभदमनात्सर्वदमनः पुनर्यास्यत्याख्यां भरत इति लोकस्य भरणात्). It is likely that in Kālidāsa's days Śakuntala's son had not been probably connected with the name Bhāratavarṣa, otherwise there would have been nothing to prevent the poet from adding another prophecy about him that a varṣa would be named after him. Pāṇini speaks of prācyas and Bharatas (II. 4. 66, IV. 2. 113). The Bharatas were an ancient people mentioned several times even in the Ṛgveda; vide III. 33. 11–12. The Bharatas are spoken of as grāma i. e. a group or saṅgha, to have crossed the confluence of the rivers Vipāś and Śutudri (modern Beas and Sutlaj), III. 23. 2 (Bharatas are said to have produced Agni by attrition), III. 53. 12 (where the prayer of Viśvāmitra is said to have protected Bhārata-jana). Agni is styled Bhārata in several verses (as in Ṛg. II. 7. 1 and 5, IV. 25. 4, VI. 16. 19 and 45). It is stated in the Ait. Brāhmaṇa (39. 9) that Dīrghatamā Māmateya crowned Bharata Dauṣpanti (Dauṣyanti) by the Aindra Mahābhiṣeka, that Bharata thereon conquered the earth all round, performed many Aśvamedha sacrifices and then five ślokas are quoted stating that Bharata made gifts of innumerable elephants in Masnāra country, that he performed sacrifices on the banks of the Yamunā river and on the

(*Continued on next page*)

principal mountains of Bhāratvarṣa are Mahendra, Malaya, Sahya, Śuktimat, Ṛkṣaparvata, Vindhya and Pāriyātra. The Purāṇas affirm that Bhārata is the best in the varṣas of Jambudvīpa (Brahma 19. 23-24, Viṣṇu III. 3. 22, Brahmāṇḍa II. 16. 17). Some of them contain fine eulogies of Bhārata (e. g. Brahma 27. 2.9 and 69-79, Viṣṇu II. 3. 23-26.).

In several Purāṇas nine divisons of Bhāratavarṣa are named viz. Indradvīpa, Kaśeru, Tāmraparṇa, Gabhastimat, Nāgadvīpa, Sahys, Gandharva, Vāruṇa and a ninth which is 1000 yojanas long from north to south, on the east of which are Kirātas and on the west Yavanas and the four varṇas in the middle of it.[2484]. It may be noted that though Bhāratavarṣa is only one the divisions of Jambudvīpa, some of the nine divisions are themselves called Indradvīpa and Nāgadvīpa. Another important matter is that Matsya 114. 10, Vāyu 45. 81, Vāmana 13. 11, and Brahmāṇḍa appear to call the 9th dvīpa Kumāra or as extending from Kumārikī to the sources of the Gaṅgā. There-

---

(Continued from last page)

Ganges; the last verse (the 5th) says 'महाकर्म भरतस्य न पूर्वे नापरे जनाः। दिवं मर्त्य इव हस्ताभ्यां नोदापुः पञ्चमानवाः॥'. Vide Śatapatha Br. XIII. 5. 4. 11–13 (for Bharata Dauṣpanti born of Śakuntalā, where four gāthās are quoted about him, three of which are almost the same as in Ait. Br. and it is added that he attained the same sway or eminence that belongs to the Bharatas in its times. The Atharvaveda frequently refers to Himavat (as in V. 4. 8, XIX. 39. 1) and it is said that Kuṣṭha plant is found in the north and is taken to the east from Himavat and that (Atharva VI. 24. 1 and 3) all rivers flow from Himavat and join the ocean (Sindhu). The महाभाष्य on Pāṇ. II. 4. 66 remarks that Bharatas are not found in any countries other than those in the east.

2484. भारतस्यास्य वर्षस्य नवभेदान् निशामय। इन्द्रद्वीपः कसेरुश्च ताम्रपर्णो गभस्तिमान्। नागद्वीपस्तथा सौम्यो गन्धर्वस्त्वथ वारुणः। अयं तु नवमस्तेषां द्वीपः सागरसंवृतः। योजनानां सहस्रं तु द्वीपोऽयं दक्षिणोत्तरात्। पूर्वे किराता यस्यान्ते पश्चिमे यवनाः स्मृताः॥ ब्राह्मणाः क्षत्रिया वैश्या मध्ये शूद्राश्च भागशः॥ विष्णु II. 3. 6–9, मार्क. 54. 5–8 and Brahmāṇḍa II. 16. 8 add one half verse समुद्रान्तरिता ज्ञेयास्ते त्वगम्याः परस्परम् (after भारतस्यास्य ... मे), वामन 13.8–11 (reads नागद्वीपः कटाहश्च सिंहलो वारुणस्तथा, and adds कुमाराख्यः परिख्यातो द्वीपोऽयं दक्षिणोत्तरः after अयं ... संवृतः), वायु 45. 78–83 (adds आयतो ह्या कुमारिक्याद् गङ्गाप्रभवाच्च वै and one verse more after this). ब्रह्मपु. (27. 14–17 and 19–20) has also the verses इन्द्रद्वीपः ... यवनाः स्मृताः but the first verse is शृणुध्वं भारतं वर्षं नवभेदेन भो द्विजाः। समुद्रान्तरिता ज्ञेयास्ते समाश्च परस्परम् (v. l. दुर्गम्याः परस्परम्). The मत्स्य (14. 7–12) has some of the above verses but adds आयतस्तु कुमारीतो गङ्गायाः प्रवहावधिः (प्रभवावधिः?)। तिर्यगूर्ध्वं तु विस्तीर्णः सहस्राणि दशैव तु।. Agni 118 also has similar verses. The ब्रह्माण्ड II. 16. 11 adds आयतो ह्याकुमार्यां वै त्वा गंगाप्रभवाच्च वै। तिर्यगुत्तरविस्तीर्णः सहस्राणि नवैव तु.

fore, it appears that the 9th division of Bhāratvarṣa was held to be a country like modern India and the other eight divisions seem to be countries and islands lying to the south-east of present India. It is probable that early works identified Bhāratvarṣa with what is now modern India, but when Indian culture spread to South-East Asia, Bhāratavarṣa was used to denote India as well as Greater India.

Śabara (bhāṣya on Jai. X. 1. 35) shows that the language of cultured people from the Himavat *to* cape *Comorin* was the same (prasiddhaśca sthālyām caruśabdaḥ ā Himavataḥ ā ca Kumārībhayaḥ prajujyamāno dṛṣṭaḥ). Vide also his bhāṣya on Jai. X. 1. 42 for the same words. The snow-capped mountains were known to the sages of the Ṛgveda (vide X. 121, 4 'yasyeme Himavanto mahitvā yasya samudram rasayā sahāhuḥ). 'Yasya' in the verse quoted refers to Hiraṇyagarbha. The Atharvaveda (V. 4. 2 and 8) mentions Himavat in the singular. *Parvatas* (plural) occur several times in Ṛg. III. 33. 1, IV. 54. 5 and also *parvata* in the singular (Ṛg. I. 37. 7, V. 56. 4). The Mahābhārata, Śabara, Purāṇas and the Bṛhat-saṁhitā show that ancient Indian people identified their culture with Bhāratavarṣa i. e. they identified country and culture, not race with culture.

The Brahmapurāṇa and the Mārkaṇḍeya appear to confine Bhāratvarṣa substantially to what has been known for centuries as India when they describe it as 'to its south, west and east there is the great ocean, to its north is Himavat resembling the string of a bow.'[2485] Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 11–16 for discussion as to the limits of Āryāvarta and pp. 17–18 for Bhārata-varṣa.

The Vāyu devotes about 1000 verses (chap. 36-49) to what is called Bhuvanavinyāsa (arrangement of the universe), the Brahma devotes chap. 18-21 to the same viz. Bhuvanakośa, the Matsya chap. 114 deals with Bhuvanakośa, Kūrma I. 40 is called Bhuvanavinyāsa and deals with dvīpas and varṣas.

The countries[2486] of ancient and medieval India are enumerated in Viṣṇu II. 3. 15–18, Vāyu 45. 109–136, Brahmāṇḍa II. 16.

2485. दक्षिणापरतो यस्य पूर्वे चैव महोदधिः। हिमवानुत्तरेणास्य कार्मुकस्य यथा गुणः। तदेतद्भारतं वर्षं सर्वबीजं द्विजोत्तमाः। ब्रह्म. 27. 65–66, मार्कं० 54. 59.

2486. For the Janapadas and other geographical data in Pāṇini, vide J. of U. P. H. S. Vol. 16 pp. 10-51 by Dr. V. S. Agravala and IHQ Vol. 21 pp. 297–314 for countries in the Purāṇas and Dr. D. C. Sirkar's 'Text of the Purāṇic list of peoples' in IHQ vol. 19 pp. 297–314. It appears from

(*Continued on next page*)

40-68, Matsya 114. 34-56, Mārkaṇḍeya 54, Padma (Ādi 6. 34-59), Vāmana 13. 36 ff. The Bhīṣmaparva (chap. 9) mentions countries and peoples. In the Nakṣatrakūrmādhyāya of the Bṛhatsaṁhitā of Varāhmihira (chap. 14. 1-33) numerous names and countries in the centre of Bhāratavarṣa and in the eight directions of it are set out. Many rivers are named in the Ṛgveda. In Ṛgveda X. 75. 5-6 eighteen or nineteen rivers are mentioned in order from the Ganges towards the west up to Kubhā (Kabul river), Gomatī, Krumu (modern Kurram). Twenty-one rivers, seven in three groups, are referred to in Ṛgveda) X. 64. 8 and X. 75.1 and 99, in Ṛgveda I. 32.12 and X. 104.8 seven Sindhus are mentioned and in (Ṛgveda II. 12. 12, IV. 28. 1, X. 43, 3). Rivers are enumerated as flowing from the principal mountains in Matsya 114. 20-33, Kūrma I. 47. 28-39, Brahmāṇḍa II. 16. 24-39, Vāmana 13, 20-35 and 34. 6-8, Brahma 19. 10-14 and 27. 25-40, Padma (Ādikhaṇḍa 6. 10-32). The Anuśāsanaparva (chap. 165. 19-29) mentions many rivers.

Pātālas (nether regions) are generaly mentioned as seven, but the names slightly vary in the several Purāṇas. Vide Vāyu 50. 11-12, Brahma 21. 2-3 and 54. 20-11, Brahmāṇḍa II. 20. 10 ff, Kūrma I. 44. 15-25, Viṣṇu II. 5. 2-3.

The Bhāṣya of Vyāsa on Y. S. III. 25 (26 in some editions) 'bhuvanajñānam sūrye saṁyamāt' contains a concise but remarkably detailed summary of the description of the seven lokas (bhūr, bhuvaḥ, svaḥ, mahaḥ, jana, tapas and satya,[2487]

(Continued from last page)

Pāṇini that he was well acquainted with the whole of India from the extreme northwest to Kalinga (modern Orissa) and Aśmaka (region about Ajanta and Paithan) and modern Kutch as he expressly names Gāndhāra (IV. 1. 169), Suvāstu (in IV. 2. 77, modern Swat), Kamboja (IV. 1. 175) and Takṣaśilā (IV. 3. 93), Sindhu (IV. 3. 93), Śalātura (IV. 3. 94, the birth place of Pāṇini who is hence called Śalāturīya by later writers like Bhāmaha), Sauvīra (IV. 1. 148), Kaccha (IV. 2. 133), Magadha, Kaliṅga, Sūramasa (Surma valley ?) in IV. 1. 170, Aśmaka (IV. 1. 173). Cunningham's 'Ancient Geography of India (1872), Nundolal Dey's 'The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India' (1927), 'Bibliography of Ancient Geography of India' by Surendranath Majumdar' in I. A. Vol. 48 (for 1919) pp. 15-23 and 'the list of Tīrthas' in the author's H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 723-825 may be consulted for ancient Indian Geography.

2487. The words for the three or seven Vyāhṛtis were supposed to denote *lokas*. Vide Tai. Br. II. 2. 4. 3 'एता वै व्याहृतय इमे लोकाः' and Tai. Up. I. 5 भूरिति वा अयं लोकः । भुव इत्यन्तरिक्षम् । सुवरित्यसौ लोकः । मह इत्यादित्यः । आदित्येन वाव सर्वे लोका महीयन्ते ।; the कूर्मपुराण (I. 44. 1-4) mentions the lokas from महः to सत्य.

the seven narakas from Avīci upwards, the seven pātālas, the earth with seven dvīpas, the seven parvatas with Meru in the middle of the earth, varṣas, the seven dvīpas, jambu, śaka, kuśa, krauñca, śālmala, gomedha (not gomedaka as in the printed Purāṇas) and Puṣkara, the seven seas, the parks of the gods, their assembly hall called Sudharmā and city called Sudarśana and palace called Vaijayanta, the groups of gods in Mahendra-loka, Prājāpatya-loka, in Jana, Tapas and Satya lokas. Many of these details closely agree with the enumerations and descriptions in the Purāṇas. This shows that the Paurāṇika cosmography had been established long before the 4th century A. D.

CHAPTER XXXV

The doctrine of Karma and Punarjanma (transmigration or metempsychosis)

This is one of the most fundamental doctrines of the Indian system of religion and philosophy, is an endeavour to answer the question that occurs to all thoughtful persons, viz. what happens to man after the death of the body and has influenced for thousands of years or at least from the times of the Upaniṣads all Indian thought and all Hindus, Jains and Buddhists. This is a vast subject and has during the last few decades attracted the minds of numerours writers in the West. There is now a voluminous literature in the West on reincarnation.[2487a] Several countries in historical times believed in transmigration. Herodotus[2487b] states that some of the Greeks (whose names he knew but did not disclose) had used that doctrine as their own, but that the Egyptians were the first to teach that the human soul was immortal and that at the time of the death of the body it entered into some other living thing then coming to birth. Pythagoras appears to have believed in it and there are controversies whether he derived it from India. Prof. A. B. Keith (in J. R. A. S. for 1909 pp. 569-606) after a lengthy discussion holds that Pythagoras did not borrow it from India. The present writer does not express any opinion on that subject as it is irrelevant for the purpose of this volume. Hopkins and Macdonnell accept the theory of Indian Influence on Pythagoras, but Oldenberg and Keith do not.

Not only Pythagoras, but Empedocles (who is reported to have said that he was a boy, a girl, a bush, a bird and a fish) and Plato believed in the pre-existence and post-existence of the soul, in the idea that the bodies which will accompany the soul in several births would bear similitude to the lives that

---

2487a. Even so early as 1913, E. D. Walker (Rider and Co., London) devotes to a bibliography of books and articles on 'Reincarnation' 15 pages (pp. 329-343).

2487b. Vide English translation of Herodotus by A. D. Godley, Vol. I. (book II. 123).

they had led, that the happiest would be those who had practised the social and civil virtues called temperance and justice and that supersensible thinking would be the only means of disengaging the soul from successive lives of sense. Vide Kenneth Walker's 'The circle of Life' p. 93 (where he says that the doctrine of metempsychosis was probably well-known in India at the time of Christ) and Gough's 'Philosophy of the Upaniṣads' (London 1882), pp. 25–28, where he cites a long passage from Plato's Phaedon on this subject and pp. 29–31 for a long quotation from Hume's Dialogues concernig Natural Religion on the miseries and migration of the soul from body to body. Gough on p. 25 of the above work opines that since in the Vedic literature prior to the Upanisads there is no reference to the belief in the passage of the soul into plants and human bodies, it is reasonable to suppose that the Hindus borrowed this doctrine from the indigenes in the course of their absorption of indigenous blood. Vide also 'Studies in honour of Bloomfield' pp. 76–88 for G. W. Brown's views to the same effect. This is a most gratuitous assumption, it is a pure conjecture and without any evidence whatever. If belief in transmigration could exist among Egyptians and many primitive tribes, there is no reason to assume that Indians did not themselves arrive at the doctrine, particularly when there exists nowhere else in the whole world any theory of Karma and transmigration so detailed, so influential and so thorough as in Sanskrit Literature. One may dismiss the conjectures of Gough and G. W. Brown as verbiage (the latter conjectures on pp. 87–88 that even the words Yoga, Sāṅkhya and Upaniṣad are coined from similar words in some Dravidian tongue now lost). All Scholars (particularly Western ones when writing about the East) should lay to heart the words of Mallinātha 'nāmūlam likhyate kiñcit'. The present writer is not against conjectures at all but they must not be bold and must always be treated as such. But the danger is that the conjectures of former scholars or men are often treated as valid conclusions by later writers. All scholars must bear in mind Acton's warning 'Guard against the prestige of great names; no trusting without testing'. In the H. of Dh. Vol. IV. pp. 38–40 the doctrine of Karma and Punarjanma was briefly discussed in relation to the consequence of sins and their removal and details were reserved for treatment later.

In the present chapter the author proposes to examine the Vedic literature for tracing the origin and the growth of

this doctrine and the vicissitudes and modifications of it and the objections raised against it in modern times. It is a remarkable circumstance that, though the several *darśanas* (such as Sānkhya, Yoga, Nyāya, Vaiśesika, Pūrvamīmāmsā and Vedānta) severely criticize some doctrines of each other, the doctrine of Karma and transmigration received almost unanimous support except among materialists (like Cārvāka). Prof. Wilson in 'Religion of the Hindus' (London, ed. of 1862) vol. II, p. 112 remarks 'metempsychosis is not only the one point on which all are agreed, it is the one point which none have ever disputed'. The Buddhists and Jains, though they differed on many matters from Vedic and Smrti literature, adopted this doctrine in their own way. There are some suppositions antecedent to all beliefs in Karma and transmigration viz. (1) man has a soul, eternal and separate from the physical body, (2) that other organisms, animals, plants and probably inanimate objects possess souls, (3) that the souls of men and lower animals can pass from one kind of physical organism to another, (4) that the soul is both doer and sufferer.

It has already been shown at some length (in Vol. IV. pp. 154–171) how ideas of Heaven and Hell were developed from ancient Vedic times and it has been stated (on p. 158 of that volume) that the doctrine of Karma and transmigration modified the doctrine of Heaven and Hell.

The word *karma* occurs in the Ṛgveda over forty times. In some passages it appears to mean 'exploits' or 'valiant deeds' as in the following : 'Observe the exploits of Visnu' (Ṛg. 1. 22. 19), 'proclaim by your word (or verses) the [2488] ancient deeds of Him (Indra) who is worthy of praise' (Ṛg. I. 61. 13); 'that deed of his (of Indra), who is wonderful, is most worthy of worship, that deed is most beautiful, that he filled with sweet waters of four rivers' (Ṛg. I. 62. 6); 'who is firm in each exploit' (Ṛg. I. 101. 4); 'O Indra! four are your divine and unconquerable names,... under which you performed exploits' (Ṛg. X. 54. 4); 'O Aśvins! frequent drinkers of delicious Soma and Lords of splendour, you helped (or protected) Indra in his exploits

---

2488 अस्येदु प्र ब्रूहि पूर्व्याणि तुरस्य कर्माणि नव्य उक्थैः। ऋ. I. 61. 13; तदु प्रयक्षतममस्य कर्म दस्मस्य चारुतममस्ति दंसः। उपह्वरे यदुपरा अपिन्वन् मध्वर्णसो नद्यश्चतस्रः॥ Ṛg. I. 62.6; युवं सुराममश्विना नमुचावासुरे सचा। विपिपाना शुभस्पती इन्द्रं कर्मस्वावतम्॥ ऋ. X. 131. 4.

against Namuci, son of Asura (or of the Asura breed)' in Ṛg. X. 131. 4. In several other passages of the Ṛgveda 'karma' means 'religious works' (such as sacrifices or gifts); '(the gods) accept (or like) all works of this poet who brings to you a hymn of praise'[2489] (Ṛg. I. 148. 2); (O Indra), give your ear to (the prayer) of Śyāvāśva who offers Soma to you, as you listened to (the prayers of) Atri who performed religious works' (Ṛg. VIII. 36. 7); O pure Soma! with thy help our ancient and wise forefathers performed works' (Ṛg. IX. 96. 11). In very ancient times Heaven was believed to be the place for enjoying the rewards of most works. Rewards of this world such as wealth, heroic sons were no doubt prayed for, but it was immortality (*amṛtatva*) and the joys of heaven, that were highly valued. In Ṛg. X. 16. 4 Agni is prayed to take the deceased to the world of those who performed good works (tābhir-vahainam sukṛtām u lokam). The words 'sukṛtām lokam' occur in the Atharvaveda[2490] (III. 28. 6, XVIII. 3. 71) and in the Vāj. S. 18. 52. In Ṛg. IX. 113. 7-10 the sacrificer who offers Soma to Indra prays that he may be placed in that world (heaven) as an immortal, where there is never-ending light, where Yama, the son of Vivasvat, is the King, where there are joys and delights and where there are desires and their fulfilment. The prayers for immortality are made in the Ṛgveda to all gods, e. g. to Agni in I. 31. 7, IV 58. 1, V. 4. 10., Vi. 7. 4, to the Maruts in V. 55. 4, to Mitra and Varuṇa in V. 63. 2, to Viśve-Devas in X. 52. 5 and X. 62. 1, to Soma in I. 91. 1, IX. 94. 4, IX. 108. 3. But about the fate of evil-doers not much is said in the Ṛgveda. In the Brāhmaṇa works greater details are offered as to rewards of good works and the retribution for evil deeds. Śat. Br. (XII. 9. 1. 1) puts forth the idea of retribution (cited above).[2491] The same idea is set forth as to flesh-eating in Manu and Viṣṇu-dharmasūtra, which state

---

2489. जुषन्त विश्वान्यस्य कर्मोपस्तुतिं भरमाणस्य कारोः। ऋ. I. 148. 2: श्यावाश्वस्य सुन्वतस्तथा शृणु यथा शृणोरत्रेः कर्माणि कृण्वतः। ऋ. VIII. 36. 7; the same verse is repeated in VIII. 37. 7 (with रेभतः for सुन्वतः); त्वया हि नः पितरः सोम पूर्वे कर्माणि चक्रुः पवमान धीराः। ऋ. IX. 96. 11.

2490. ताभ्यां पतेम सुकृतामु लोकं यत्र ऋषयो जग्मुः प्रथमजाः पुराणाः। वाज. सं. 18. 52; शरीरमस्य संदहाथैनं धेहि सुकृतामु लोके॥ अथर्व. XVIII. 3. 71.

2491. एतस्माद्वै यज्ञात्पुरुषो जायते। स यद्ध वा अस्मिँल्लोके पुरुषोऽन्नमत्ति तदेनममुष्मिँल्लोके प्रत्यत्ति। शतपथ XII. 9. 1. 1; मां स भक्षयितामुत्र यस्य मांसमिहाद्म्यहम्। एतन्मांसस्य मांसत्वं प्रवदन्ति मनीषिणः॥ मनु. V. 55, विष्णुधर्मसूत्र 51. 78; मां means 'me' and सः 'that being' and the word मांस (that contains these two) is explained as above.

"that being whose flesh I eat here would eat me in the next world, the wise declare this to be the origin of the word 'māṁsa'." The Śat. Br. in another passage refers to a strange legend.[2492] Bhṛgu, who had become vain on account of his learning and thought himself more learned than his father Varuṇa, was asked by his father to go to the four quarters from east to north and report what he would see there. Horrible sights met him in all directions e. g. in the east he saw men dismembering men, hewing off their limbs one by one and saying 'this to you, this to me'. He said 'this is horrible'. They replied 'these indeed dealt with us in yonder world and so we now deal with them in return'. Then in the north he saw that men crying aloud were being eaten by men crying aloud. When he said 'horrible &c'; they replied 'these indeed dealt with us...in return'. This is a long story and it is not necessary to set out the whole. This story probably gives expression to the popular notion of 'tit for tat'. But one thing is clear that the Śat. Br. indicates by this story that a belief had then arisen that one who does evil in one life has to suffer for it in a later life from that being whom he treated badly. The Śat. Br and the Tai. Br. both several times speak of conquering or casting off '*punarmṛtyu*' (renewed death, liability to be born and die again and again). Two passages from the Śat. Br. and Tai. Br. may be quoted. In X. 4. 4 the Śat. Br. tells the story that gods became immortal by means of the proper performance of Agnicayana as Prajāpati advised them viz. by laying down 360 enclosing stones, 360 Yajuṣmatī bricks and 36 more thereon, 10800 Lokampṛṇā bricks. In X. 4. 4. 9 it is said 'he who is to become immortal through knowledge (vidyā)[2493] and through sacred works (*karman*) shall become immortal after separating from the body', and then X. 4. 4. 10 asserts that 'those who know this or those who do this holy work come to life again after dying and coming to life they secure immortal life; but those who do not know

2492. स तत एव प्राङ् प्रवव्राज। एतु पुरुषैः पुरुषान्पर्वाण्येषां पर्वशः संवृश्चं सर्वशो विभजमानानिदं तवेदं ममेति। स होवाच भीष्मं बत भोः। पुरुषान्वा एतत्पुरुषाः पर्वाण्येषां पर्वशः संवृश्च्य पर्वशो व्यभक्षतेति ते होचुरित्थं वा इमेऽस्मानमुष्मिँल्लोकेऽसचन्त तान्वयमिदमिह प्रतिसचामह इति। ... स ह तत एवोदङ् प्रवव्राज। एतु पुरुषैः पुरुषानाक्रन्दयत आक्रन्दयद्भिरद्यमानान्। स होवाच। भीष्मं बत भोः पुरुषान् वा एतत्पुरुषाः आक्रन्दयत आक्रन्दयन्तोऽदन्तीति। ते होचुरित्थं वा इमेऽस्मा ... सचामह इति। शतपथ XI. 6, 1. 3-6.

2493. ते य एवमेतद्विदुर्ये वै तत्कर्म कुर्वते मृत्वा पुनः सम्भवन्ति ते सम्भवन्त एवामृतत्वमभि सम्भवन्त्यथ य एवं न विदुर्ये वै तत्कर्म न कुर्वते मृत्वा पुनः सम्भवन्ति त एतस्यैवान्नं पुनः पुनर्भवन्ति। शतपथ X 4. 3. 10.

this or do not perform this sacred work come to life again when they die and they become the food of him (Death) time after time.' In the Tai. Br. III. 11. 8 the story of Naciketas is narrated just as in the Kaṭhopaniṣad (some of the verses are the same in both). Death grants Naciketas three boons in the Tai. Br., the third being different in the Kaṭhopaniṣad. The third boon asked by Naciketas in Tai. Br. is 'Declare to me how to cast off *punarmṛtyu.*' Death declared to him the Nāciketa fire, thereby he (Naciketas) cast off or kept off *punarmṛtyu.*[2494] The words 'apa punarmṛtyum jayati' occur in Kauṣītaki Br. 25. 1 and several times in the Bṛ. Up. I. 2. 7., I. 5. 2, III. 2., 10, III. 3. 2.

From the ancient popular idea of retribution for evil deeds probably arose the idea of the setting of good deeds against the evil deeds of a person and weighing them as if in a balance. The Śat. Br. states[2495] 'Now this one is the balance, viz. the right side of the vedi.[2496] Let him sit down touching the right edge of the vedi, for indeed they place him on the balance in yonder world and whichever of two will rise he will follow, whether it be good or evil. And whosoever knows this mounts the balance even in this world and escapes being placed on the balance in yonder world, for it is good deed that rises and not his evil deed'.

The Śatapatha had arrived at the idea that man's will (and corresponding deed) governs what world he will reach after death. It says 'Let him meditate on truth as brahma. Now man here is mostly will and, according as his will is when he departs from this world, does he on departing become of similar will in the yonder world'.[2496]

There is a curious passage in the Śatapatha (X. 1. 5. 4) about the powers conferred by sacrifices in the yonder world. It states that he who had regularly performed Agnihotra eats food

---

2494. तृतीयं वृणीष्वेति। पुनर्मृत्योर्मेऽपचितिं ब्रूहीति होवाच। तस्मै हैतमग्निं नाचिकेतमुवाच ततो वै सोऽप पुनर्मृत्युमजयत्। अप पुनर्मृत्युं जयति योऽग्निं नाचिकेतं चिनुते य उ चैनमेवं वेद। तै. ब्रा. III. 11. 8. 6.

2495. अथ हैषैव तुला यद्दक्षिणो वेद्यन्तः स यत्साधु करोति तदन्तर्वेद्यथ यदसाधु तद्बहिर्वेदि। तस्माद्दक्षिणं वेद्यन्तमधिस्पृश्येवासीत। तुलायां ह वाऽमुष्मिँल्लोक आदधति यतरद्यंस्यति तदन्वेष्यति यदि साधु वाऽसाधु वेति। अथ य एवं वेदास्मिन्हैव लोके तुलामारोहत्यत्यमुष्मिँल्लोके तुलाधानं मुच्यते। साधुकृत्या हैवास्य यच्छति न पापकृत्या। शतपथ XI. 2. 7. 33. Here the edge of the right side of the Vedi is spoken of as the beam of the balance.

2496. सत्यं ब्रह्मेत्युपासीत। अथ खलु क्रतुमयोऽयं पुरुषः स यावत्क्रतुरस्माल्लोकात्प्रैत्येवं क्रतुर्हामुं लोकं प्रेत्याभिसम्भवति। शतपथ X. 6. 3. 1.

in the evening and morning in the yonder world, the performer of Darśa and Pūrṇamāsa sacrifice eats food every half month; the performer of Cāturmāsyas (seasonal sacrifices) eats food in the yonder worlds every four months. the performer of animal sacrifice every six months: the Soma sacrificer once a year; the builder of the fire after (agnicit) eats food every hundred years at his will or may not require it at all after once taking it, for a hundred years are as much as immortality, unending and everlasting.

The Śat. Br. had arrived at the conclusion that every man is born in a world fashioned by himself. It also asserted that he who sacrifices to the gods does not win such a place as the one who sacrifices to the Ātman and the latter frees himself from the mortal body, from sin, as a snake frees itself from its slough[2497].

It must be conceded that a clear statement about the doctrine of karma and punarjanma is absent from the whole of the Ṛgveda. Ṛg. VII. 33 is an important hymn. The first nine verses are spoken by Vasiṣṭha about his sons. Verses 10–14 refer to Vasiṣṭha[2498] himself and are either attributed to his sons or according to another view are part of a dialogue with Indra. The verses are mythological, mystical and rather difficult to explain. Verse 10 refers to one birth of Vasiṣṭha when the gods Mitra and Varuṇa saw him reaching the refulgence of lightning and it is said that Agastya brought him (Vasiṣṭha) to the people. Here the words 'ekam janma' indicate that another janma of Vasiṣṭha is intended in this hymn. Verse 11 refers to Vasiṣṭha as born of Mitra and Varuṇa from Urvaśī and states that all the gods placed him in *puṣkara* (either antarikṣa or lotus); verse 12 is important for the metaphorical and mystical statement that

---

2497. तदाहुः । आत्मयाजी श्रेयान् देवयाजी ३ ... इत्यात्मयाजीति ह ब्रूयात् । ... स यथाहिस्त्वचो निर्मुच्येतैवमस्मान्मर्त्याच्छरीरात्पाप्मनो निर्मुच्यते स ... स्वर्गं लोकमभिसम्भवति । अथ ह स देवयाजी ... न तावन्तं लोकं जयति यावन्तमितरः । शतपथ XI. 2. 6. 13-14.

2498. विद्युतो ज्योतिः परि संजिहानं मित्रावरुणा यदपश्यतां त्वा । तत्ते जन्मोतैकं वसिष्ठागस्त्यो यत्त्वा विश आजभार ॥ उतासि मैत्रावरुणो वसिष्ठोर्वश्या ब्रह्मन्मनसोऽधि जातः । द्रप्सं स्कन्नं ब्रह्मणा दैव्येन विश्वे देवाः पुष्करे त्वाददन्त ॥ स प्रकेत ... सदानः । यमेन ततं परिधिं वयिष्यन्नप्सरसः परि जज्ञे वसिष्ठः ॥ सत्रे ह जाताविषिता नमोभिः कुम्भे रेतः सिषिचतुः समानम् । ततो ह मान उदियाय मध्यात्ततो जातमृषिमाहुर्वसिष्ठम् ॥ ऋ. VII. 33. 10-13. The verse उतासि is explained in the Nirukta V. 14. मानः is explained as शमीप्रमाण or शम्याप्रमाण (of the measure of a yoke-pin). For शम्या (ordinarily 32 aṅgulas), vide H. of Dh. vol, II. p. 1112 n 2487.

wishing to weave the cloth stretched by Yama, Vasiṣṭha was born from Urvaśī. Verse 13 refers to the seed cast in a pitcher by the two (Mitra and Varuṇa) from the midst of which arose (Agastya) and from which also Vasiṣṭha was born. Verse 14 is addressed to Pratṛds (the Tritsus according to Sāyaṇa) and calls upon them to wait upon (or honour) Vasiṣṭha who would be coming to them (for performing sacrifice. This, it seems, is the second birth of Vasiṣṭha.

Prof. R. D. Ranade[2499] in his 'Constructive survey of the Upanishadic philosophy' (pp. 145–166) relies upon certain mantras of the Ṛgveda for stating that there is evidence for holding that an approach to the idea of Transmigration was being made by the vedic sages (p. 147), though he concedes (on the same page) that in the major part of the Ṛgveda the idea of transmigration is conspicuous by its absence.

Among the texts on which he relies are Ṛg. I. 164. 3, 4, 16, 17, 20, 30, 31, 38. The whole hymn has several riddles, has highly imaginative descriptions of the year, the path of the Sun, questions and answers and is a late hymn, as he him self admits (p. 150). Verses 3 and 17 contain nothing suggestive of punarjanma. Verse 4 is really concerned with the first creation, as it literally means 'who saw that one that *was first being born*, when the boneless (prakṛti) bears a body possessing bones; where was the life (prāṇa) of the earth, or its blood or its

---

2499. All verses on which Prof. Ranade relies are set out here in one place: को ददर्श प्रथमं जायमानमस्थन्वन्तं यदनस्था बिभर्ति । भूम्या असुरसृगात्मा क्व स्वित् को विद्वांसमुप गात्प्रष्टुमेतत् ॥ ऋ. I. 164. 4; स्त्रियः सतीस्ताँ उ मे पुंस आहुः पश्यदक्षण्वान्न वि चेतदन्धः । कविर्यः पुत्रः स ईमा चिकेत यस्ता विजानात्स पितुष्पितासत् ॥ 16; अवः परेण पर एनावरेण पदा वत्सं बिभ्रती गौरुदस्थात् । स कद्रीची कं स्विदर्धं परागात् क्व स्वित्सूते नहि यूथे अन्तः ॥ 17; द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परि षस्वजाते । तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्यो अभि चाकशीति । 20; अनच्छये तुरगातु जीवमेजद् ध्रुवं मध्य आ पस्त्यानाम् । जीवो मृतस्य चरति स्वधाभिरमर्त्यो मर्त्येना सयोनिः ॥ 30; अपश्यं गोपामनिपद्यमानमा च परा च पथिभिश्चरन्तम् । स सध्रीचीः स विषूचीर्वसान आ वरीवर्ति भुवनेष्वन्तः ॥ 31; अपाङ् प्राङेति स्वधया गृभीतोऽमर्त्यो मर्त्येना सयोनिः । ता शश्वन्ता विषूचीना वियन्ता न्यन्यं चिक्युर्न नि चिक्युरन्यम् ॥ 38; the word जीव occurs only in I. 164. 30. In I. 164. 38 the word जीव does not occur. At the most there is a contrast between the immortal part i. e. soul) and the mortal part (the body) in the verses 30 and 38. These two (soul and body) are always bound together; one of them (the body) is well known to people, the other (the soul) is not so known. The verse अपश्यं गोपां (ऋ. I. 164. 31) is repeated in X. 177. 3. The आश्वमेधिकपर्व 47. 16 द्वाविमौ पक्षिणौ नित्यौ is an echo of द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा etc.

self? Who (a pupil) approached a wise one (a guru) to ask this?'. Verse 16 means 'they declare to me the women that exist and the men; one possessing eyes (the light of true knowledge) may see (the Reality); the blind (the ignorant) will not know; the wise son may know this; he who knows these would be the father's father'. Sāyaṇa gives several meanings of this verse. The present author fails to understand how the words 'father's father' indicate any reference to transmigration in this verse, as Prof. Ranade asserts. Why he presses this verse of I. 164 into service the present author cannot understand. After referring to I. 164. 32 (which doubts whether he who created all this knows its real nature) he states 'it sets such a high price on the mystical knowledge which it glorifies that any one who comes in possession of this knowledge may be said to be his father's father.' To whom does 'his' refer?.

The verse 20 'dvā suparṇā' also occurs in the Muṇḍakopaniṣad III. 1. and ŚV. Up. IV. 6 and refers to the individual soul and the Supreme Self and tells us that the former is bhoktṛ (taster of worldly pleasures), while the latter simply looks on. But so far as the present writer can see there is absolutely nothing about a former or future life in the verse. Verse 30 draws a sharp distinction between the self which is immortal and the body which is mortal and states that the two are bound together to the same place. Verse 31 is a description of the movements of the Sun who is called 'gopā' (protector, guardian) and speaks of his coming to the worlds again and again. Prof. Ranade sees too much in the words 'gopām', which is applied to Agni (Ṛg. I. 1. 8, I. 96. 7), to Soma (in Ṛg. VI. 52. 3), to Varuṇa (in Ṛg. VIII. 42. 2), to Viṣṇu in Ṛg. I. 22. 18. In Ṛg. III. 43. 5 the words 'gopām janasya' (protector of the people) occur. Prof. Ranade translates (p. 151) 'he saw the guardian returning frequently to mundane regions'. Why should we not translate (particularly when we have the words 'bhuvaneṣvantaḥ') 'I saw the guardian Sun again and again returning to the worlds and moving towards me and away from me by different paths'?. Prof. Ranade also[2500] relies on Ṛg. X. 16. 3 and particularly on the

2500. सूर्यं चक्षुर्गच्छतु वातमात्मा द्यां च गच्छ पृथिवीं च धर्मणा। अपो वा गच्छ यदि तत्र ते हितमोषधीषु प्रति तिष्ठा शरीरैः॥ ऋ. X. 16. 3. धर्मणा means सुकृतेन (good deeds or sacrifices). In Ṛg. X. 85. 24 we have ऋतस्य योनौ सुकृतस्य लोकेऽरिष्टां त्वा

(*Continued on next page*)

word 'dharmaṇā' in it which he renders as 'his qualities'. Ṛg. X. 16 has 14 verses, is one of the funeral hymns and the cremation fire (as Agni or Jātavedas) is expressly mentioned in eleven verses. Verse 3 (addressed to the deceased) may literally be translated as 'may thy eye go to the Sun, ātman (prāṇa) to wind, go to heaven or the earth by dharman or go to the waters if you find your benefit in them; be firmly established in the plants with the limbs of the body.' The express mention of 'heaven' shows that this is only one of the numerous verses of the Ṛgveda in which heaven is referred to as the abode of those who perform good works and that there is nothing more in it than that. Vide above pp. 20–21 for the meaning of dharman (which is the only form of the word employed in the Ṛgveda) viz. 'religious rites or sacrifices' (in most Ṛgveda passages) or rarely 'fixed principles of conduct'. The very next verse (X. 16. 4) contains a prayer to Agni to carry the deceased to the world of people of good deeds (tābhirvahainam sukṛtām-u lokam). There is no reason to suppose that in Ṛg. X. 16. 3 anything more is meant than what is prayed for in verse 4. Besides, the basic idea of punarjanma is that future existence is regulated by the good or evil deeds of a person and he has no option whatever. In Ṛg. X. 16. 3 the departed spirit is told that he may go to heaven or earth or waters or plants. This is not the doctrine of punarjanma at all. In X. 16. 5 the cremation fire is addressed 'O Agni! send forth the departing man who is offered as an oblation into thee and who will move on with the food offered, again to (the world of) pitṛs; the remainder (left after the body is burnt) putting on a new life may go near (pitṛs) and be connected with (a new) body in that world.' This verse contains the same idea as in X. 16. 4 in different words and refers

---

(*Continued from last page*)

सह पत्या दधामि. Compare with ऋ. X. 16.3, शतपथ X. 3.8, स यदेवंविदस्माल्लोकात्प्रैति वाचैवाग्निमप्येति चक्षुषादित्यं मनसा चन्द्रं श्रोत्रेण दिशः प्राणेन वायुं स एतन्मय एव भूत्वैतासां देवतानां यां यां कामयते सा भूत्वेलयति; and यत्ते यमं वैवस्वतं मनो जगाम दूरकम्। तत्त आवर्तयामसीह क्षयाय जीवसे॥ ऋ X. 58. 1. The words underlined occur in all twelve verses of the hymn, which must be supposed to have been addressed to the man who is moribund. The first verse means 'thy mind that has reached far away to Yama, the son of Vivasvat, we bring back for the purpose that it may reside and live here.' The remaining eleven verses refer to the dying man's mind having gone to (i.e. as having the dying thought of) *heaven* and *earth*, to the earth with four points, four intermediate quarters, the sea, rays and high hilly tracts, waters and plants, to the Sun and Dawn, the big mountains, this whole world, most distant regions, past and future.

only to the other world (pitṛs) and not to transmigration. Prof. Ranade refers (p. 148) to Ṛg. X. 58 and translates one of the verses as meaning that the sage will recall the soul and make it live again by his song. It is not clear what verse or verses he has in view. He has probably only the first verse in view. That hymn has twelve verses in each of which a quarter is different but three quarters are the same. None of the verses contains any express word for song. Besides, mind is different from the soul even in the Ṛgveda (vide Ṛg. X. 57. 5 where both words 'manaḥ' and 'jīvam' occur). Moreover, the man is not yet dead. The composer uses the present tense (ā vartayāmasi) and means to say that he will try to prevent his dying. In the present author's opinion there is not even a distant reference to transmigration in this hymn or in any of the four hymns (Ṛg. X. 57–60) which are assigned to brothers Bandhu, Śrutabandhu and Vipra-bandhu, who are called Gaupāyanas in the Anukramaṇī. In Ṛg. X. 60. 7 Subandhu who appears to have been a brother of the three is addressed 'O Subandhu! here comes your mother, your father, your very life' etc., and in X. 60. 10 it is said 'I have brought the mind of Subandhu from Yama Vaivasvata in order that he may live and not die.'

In Ṛg. X. 14. 8 there is no reference (as some suppose) to return to this world after enjoying the fruits of good deeds in the company of pitṛs. The first half of the verse expresses that the newly departed spirit will be united with pitṛs, with Yama and with his good deeds. The 2nd half asks the departed to leave behind his sons and be united in heaven with a new and brilliant body.

Ṛg. IV. 42 (in ten verses) is a hymn of a sage-like king Trasadasyu, son of Purukutsa, who identifies himself with Indra and Varuṇa in verse 3[2501] 'I who have become enlightened about the worlds am Indra and Varuṇa and by my greatness am the two worlds (heaven and earth) that are wide, deep (spacious) and well-fixed. I sent forth heaven and earth like Tvaṣṭṛ (Prajāpati) and support them.' Here by virtue of true knowledge he identifies himself with Indra and Varuṇa but there is no conception of transmigration. Similarly, Vāmadeva

---

2501. अहमिन्द्रो वरुणस्ते महित्वोर्वी गभीरे रजसी सुमेके। त्वष्टेव विश्वा भुवनानि विद्वान् समैरयं रोदसी धारयं च॥ ऋ. IV. 42. 3. The निरुक्त IV. 19 gives several meanings of the word 'rajas', one of which is लोका रजांस्युच्यन्ते.

having attained knowledge of Reality asserts [2502] 'I have become Manu and the Sun, I am the wise sage Kakṣīvat; I reached Kutsa, the son of Arjunī, I am the seer Uśanas; look upon me (as identifiable with all)'. This verse is quoted in Bṛ. Up. I. 4. 10 (which would be set out later on and explained). In this also there is no express reference to a past birth as Manu or as the Sun. In Ṛg. IV. 27. 1 Vāmadeva declares 'while still staying in the womb (of my mother) I learnt all the births of these gods; if a hundred fortresses of *ayas* (copper or iron) had guarded me, I would have still escaped like a hawk with swiftness' (another meaning is also possible which may be set out later). This is quoted in the Ait. Up. II. 5 (to be quoted and explained later). Prof. R. D. Ranade understands (pp. 49, 153) Ṛg. IV. 26. 1 as saying that Vāmadeva makes an unconscious utterance that he was in a former life Manu or the Sun. In that verse Vāmadeva indentifies himself with five persons, Manu, Sūrya, sage Kakṣīvat, Kutsa and Uśanas. There is no word like 'janma'. On Prof. Ranade's view Vāmadeva would have to be held to state five previous births at least (and if so in a confused order). Besides, the following verses clearly show that Vāmadeva makes a claim to be identical with the Supreme Principle by giving the earth to the Āryas, sending rain to those who give offerings, making the gods follow his desire or will. The utmost that can be said is that he claims identity with the Godhead. Deussen in 'Philosophy of the Upanishads' (p. 318) holds that both the verses (Ṛg. IV. 26. 1 and IV. 27. 1.) have nothing to do with the doctrine of the soul's transmigration. The present author respectfully agrees with Deussen and thinks that Prof. Ranade is wrong. Śaṅkarācārya [2503] on V. S. I. 1. 30 explains that Indra looking upon himself as *brahma* according to the Vedāntaśāstra gives the instruction 'know me alone', quotes Bṛ. Up. I. 4. 10, and on V. S. III. 4. 51 reiterates that in Ṛg. IV. 27. 1 the Veda expressly asserts that Vāmadeva, while still in the mother's womb, realized his identity with *brahma* and then remarks that this vedic

---

2502. अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चाहं कक्षीवाँ ऋषिरस्मि विप्रः। अहं कुत्समार्जुनेयं न्यृञ्जेऽहं कविरुशना पश्यता मा॥ ऋ. IV. 26. 1. गर्भे नु सन्नन्वेषामवेदमहं देवानां जनिमानि विश्वा। शतं मा पुर आयसीररक्षन्नध श्येनो जवसा निरदीयम्। ऋ. IV. 27. 1.

2503. शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत्। वे. सू. I. 1. 30; भाष्य-इन्द्रो नाम देवतात्मानं स्वमात्मानं परमात्मत्वेनाहमेव परं ब्रह्मेत्यार्षेण दर्शनेन यथाशास्त्रं पश्यन्नुपदिशति स्म—मामेव विजानीहि-इति। यथा 'तद्धैतत्पश्यन्नृषिर्वामदेवः प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्च' इति तद्वत्। This is बृह. उप. I. 4. 10.

assertion indicates that correct knowledge of Reality may arise in a succeeding life owing to the means (or efforts) made in a previous life or lives. It may be noted that Śaṅkarācārya draws a distinction between what Śruti (Veda) expressly declares (vadanti) and what it indicates or what is to be inferred from it (darśayati).[2504]

Mr. J. S. Karandikar of Poona (a staunch disciple and follower of Lokamānya Tilak) in his learned work 'Gītātattva-mañjarī' (in Marathi, Poona 1947) asserts (on pp. 775-776) that the doctrine of transmigration is as old as the Vedic age (i. e. the Saṁhitās) and relies for this proposition on only four verses of the Ṛgveda viz. X. 14. 8, X. 16. 3 and 5 and X. 135. 6. The first three of these four have been explained above in dealing with Prof. R. D. Ranade's views. Mr. Karandikar summarises Ṛg. X. 16. 5 as a prayer to Agni that the latter should take the departed to the world of pitṛs and should send him back to his relatives after endowing him with a new brilliant body. There are no words for 'back to his relatives' nor for 'brilliant' in the verse at all. The word 'punaḥ' occurs in the first half and refers to the deceased's coming to *pitṛloka* after the body is burnt on the earth and the second half refers to the new body to be had in the world of pitṛs (and not to relatives). Ṛg. X. 14. 8. on which Mr. Karandikar relies has nothing to do with returning to the earth. After leaving his bad deeds (*avadya*) behind the deceased is asked to go to the home of the pitṛs with a brilliant body. The brilliant body is not earthly but of the pitṛ world. Ṛg. X. 135. 6. is quoted in the note below.[2505] That verse is an extremely vague one and is a riddle or is metaphorical. That hymn of seven verses is addressed to Yama and the Anukramaṇī says that the *ṛṣi* of it is Kumāra of Yama's family.

2504. गर्भस्थ एव च वामदेवः प्रतिपेदे ब्रह्मभावमिति वदन्ती जन्मान्तरसञ्चितात्साधना-जन्मान्तरे विद्योत्पत्तिं दर्शयति। न हि गर्भस्थस्यैवैहिकं किंचित्साधनं सम्भाव्यते। शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. III. 4. 51.

2505. यथाभवदनुदेयी ततो अग्रमजायत। पुरस्ताद् बुध्न आततः पश्चान्निरयणं कृतम्॥ ऋ. X. 135. 6. The word अनुदेयी occurs only thrice in the Ṛg. viz. in this hymn twice (in verses 5 and 6) and once in Ṛg. X. 85. 6 where it is in the feminine gender, means a friend of the newly married bride who goes along with her to the bridegroom's house to keep her company' (रैभ्यासीदनुदेयी). अनुदेयी literally means 'what is given after the principal gift'. Even in these days when a substantial gift is made to a brāhmaṇa, another small gift is added to it. The word निरयणं occurs only here in the whole of the Ṛgveda. अग्र and बुध्न are contrasted as top and bottom in Ṛg. X. 111. 8 'क्व स्विदग्रं क्व स्विद् बुध्न आसाम्'.

The first verse of Ṛg. X. 135 refers to Yama who is said to drink (Soma) along with the gods under a tree (i. e. in a garden) with fine foliage, where our (my) father, lord of people, desires to send (me) to the ancient fathers. It is possible that this refers to Naciketas as Sāyaṇa, following the story of Naciketas in the Tai. Br. III. 11. 8 and in the Kaṭhopaniṣad, holds. This verse may be taken as containing the words of Naciketas, sent by his angry father Vājaśravasa to the world of Yama as donation in the Viśvajit sacrifice. The 2nd verse also contains what Naciketas said viz. that he (at first) looked upon his father in anger, since he (the father) desired to send him (the son) to the ancient pitṛs in that evil way, but that he (on further consideration) liked (what the father did). He liked *the idea of facing Yama himself. Verses 3 and 4 are addressed* by Yama to the boy Naciketas who approached Yama with prayer (or metaphorically in a chariot). Verse 3 says 'O boy! the new wheel-less chariot (viz. ṛk prayer) with only one beam that you created by your intellect soars up in all directions and that you mount it without seeing (without considering the result of your action).' In Ṛg. a prayer to (and a laud of) gods is often compared to a chariot (as in V. 73. 10, VIII. 3. 15). Therefore, verse 3 suggests two meanings viz. Naciketas went to Yama in a chariot or that he sent up a prayer to Yama. Verse 4 is spoken by Yama 'O boy! that chariot (i. e. prayer which you sent up from the learned priests on the earth) was followed by Sāman (a melody) from this place (the earth) as if it were placed in a boat.' Almost all the verses of the Sāmaveda except about 75 are taken from the Ṛgveda and therefore the Chān. Up. says [2506] 'therefore Sāman is sung as resting on the ṛk'. As the melody (Sāman) is sung on a ṛk verse, the Sāman is said in this verse (4) as placed in a boat. Verse 4 may also convey another meaning. Sāman also means 'reconciliation' and the verse may be taken as referring to the legend that Yama gave the boy a boon that the boy's father would become well-disposed to him. Verse 5 contains a question (supposed to be asked by Yama). It means 'who is the father of this boy' (meaning probably that the father must be a bad man as he sent his own son to Yama)? Who sent up the chariot? Who would tell me to-day how (this boy) became *anudeyī* (a small gift accom

2506. Vide छा. उप. I. 6. 4 'नक्षत्राण्येवर्क् चन्द्रमाः साम । तदेतदेतस्यामृच्यध्यूढं साम । तस्मादृच्यध्यूढं साम गीयते । नक्षत्राण्येव सा । चन्द्रमा अमः । तत्साम ।'. Vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 1181-1184 for Sāman, Stotra and Śastra, particularly notes 2606-9.

panying the large principal gift)?' Then follows the verse on which Mr. Karandikar relies as expressing Karma and rebirth. That verse literally means 'as it or he became an *anudeyī*, it stood in front (or on top); the bottom (or base) was spread in front (or first or to the east), the coming out (or end) was behind (or afterwards or to the west).' This conveys no clear sense. But it is possible to explain it in this way, viz. though the boy was sent by his father as an *anudeyī* (as a subsidiary gift) still he came on top of all (in that Yama was pleased with him and bestowed on him three boons); he was in front of all though he (boy) was at the bottom of all gifts (i. e. though he came last of all gifts)'. There is another possible way of explaining this verse. Each Sāman in a stotra has five parts called Prastāva, Udgītha, Pratihāra, Upadrava and Nidhana (finale); vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. p. 1169 note 2589. Naciketas (who was a subsidiary donation following the donation of all his father's property and designated 'anudeyī') is deemed here to have chanted a Sāman; when he began that, the ṛk verse on which the Sāman rests went forth. The bottom of a Sāman is a ṛk verse. Therefore it is again said that the base or bottom went forward and the 'Nirayaṇa' (i. e. the nidhana of the Sāman) came last. Mr. Karandikar explains verse 6 as 'the cremation rite of the body of a deceased person shows the two-fold path; by the front path he should go to the highest world or by the hind path he should return to this world' (p. 776). It passes the present author's understanding how this translation follows from the words of verse 6. Verse 7 of the hymn presents no difficulty; it means 'this is the house of Yama that is called the the palace of gods; here is played (or blown) the flute (or tube or trumpet) for him (Yama); he (Yama) is embellished with songs (of praise).'

An interesting passage of the Taittirīya-saṁhitā[2507] may be cited here. "Whoever threatens a brāhmaṇa, he shall atone for

2507. योऽपगुराते शतेन यातयाद्यो निहनत् सहस्रेण यातयाद्यो लोहितं करवद्यावता प्रस्कद्य पांसून् संगृह्णात् तावतः संवत्सरान् पितृलोकं न प्रजानादिति। तस्माद् ब्राह्मणाय नापगुरेत, न निहन्यान्न लोहितं कुर्यादेतावता हैनसा भवति। तै. सं. II. 6. 10. 2; अभिक्रुद्धा वगोरणं ब्राह्मणस्य वर्षशतमस्वर्ग्यम्। निघाते सहस्रम्। लोहितदर्शने यावतस्तत्प्रस्कन्द्य पांसून् संगृह्णीयात्। गौ. ध. सू. 21. 20–22; शंयौ च सर्वपरिदानात्। जै. III. 4. 17; शबर 'किं प्राप्तम्। प्रकरणाद् दर्शपूर्णमासयोरवगोरणादिप्रतिषेधः। ... एवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः ... सर्वावस्थस्य "ब्राह्मणस्यायं प्रतिषेध उक्तः, न दर्शपूर्णगतैनैव नावगोरणादि कर्तव्यमिति।; तन्त्रवार्तिक (p. 950) 'शतेन यातयात् सहस्रेण यातयात्' इति शतगुणं सहस्रगुणमनुभवेदित्यर्थः। अथवा संख्येयान्तराश्रुपादनादुपरि संवत्सरग्रहणाद्विहापि संवत्सरशतेन यातनां निस्तरेत्सहस्रेणेत्येवं सम्बध्यते।."

it with a hundred years; he who strikes him (shall atone) with a thousand years; he who sheds the blood of a brāhmaṇa would not know the world of the Fathers for as many years as the number of the particles of dust that would be moistened into a ball by the stream of blood. Therefore a person should not threaten a brāhmaṇa or strike him or draw blood from his body, since (in doing so) so much (sin) is involved." This does not mean that only the world of Fathers had been conceived at the time of this passage (as Deussen supposes on p. 325 of his Ph. Up.). It will be shown below that even the Ṛgveda was well aware of both Devayāna and Pitṛyāṇa. Most men would go to pitṛloka presided over by Yama according to the Ṛg. and only the blessed would go by the Devayāna to the world of gods. This passage is important as conveying that for a very mortal sin the offender would have to suffer for a thousand years or even several thousand years and, therefore, would have to be born for several lives, since one human life was held to extend to one hundred years only (Ṛg. X. 161. 4 = Atharva III. 11. 4, Ṛg. I. 89. 9 = Vāj. S. 25. 22). Following the above Tai. S. passage, the Gautama Dh. S. provided that threatening a brāhmaṇa in anger would bar going to heaven for a hundred years (or lead to hell for &c), striking him would bar for a thousand years and on drawing blood there would be bar for as many years as the number of the particles of dust that would be made into a ball by the stream of blood. Manu (XI. 206–7) understands that the several acts against a brāhmaṇa mentioned therein would lead to the offender being consigned to hell for 100, for 1000 or for thousands of years. Jaimini (III. 4. 17) discusses this passage and holds that the prohibition is not restricted only to Darśapūrṇamāsa, but it applies to all brāhmaṇas in all conditions. It is possible to understand by the words 'śatena' and 'sahasreṇa' as a hundred or a thousand cows (or money). The Tantravārtika refers to this meaning but seems to prefer the idea of connecting the two words with years. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 151–152 where the first meaning was put forward and also A. B. Keith's tr. of the Tai. S. in the H. O. S. vol. I pp. 216–217 'him who reviles him (a brāhmaṇa) he shall fine with a hundred' &c.

The doctrine of how a man's own works and conduct fashion his future life is taught as follows in the [2508] Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 5–7:

2508. स वा अयमात्मा ब्रह्म विज्ञानमयो मनोमय ... इति। यथाकारी यथाचारी तथा भवति साधुकारी साधुर्भवति पापकारी पापो भवति पुण्यः पुण्येन कर्मणा भवति पापः पापेन।

(*Continued on next page*)

"so truly according as he works and according as he behaves so will he be, a man of good deeds will become (be born) good, a a man of evil deeds will become (be born) evil; he becomes holy by holy deeds, evil by evil deeds. Here they say 'a person only consists of desires (or is fashioned out of) desires and as his desire is so will be his (determination or) will and as is his will, so is his deed; and whatever deeds he does that he will become (reap)."[2509] On this there is av erse 'To whatever a man's mind and subtle body are attached to that he goes together with (the fruits of) his deeds and after having obtained the end

---

(*Continued from last page*)

अथो खल्वाहुः। काममय एवायं पुरुष इति। स यथाकामो भवति तत्क्रतुर्भवति यत्क्रतुर्भवति तत्कर्म कुरुते यत्कर्म कुरुते तदभिसम्पद्यते। तदेष श्लोको भवति। तदेव सक्तः सह कर्मणैति लिङ्गं मनो यत्र निषक्तमस्य। प्राप्यान्तं कर्मणस्तस्य यत्किंचेह करोत्ययम्। तस्माल्लोकात्पुनरैत्यस्मै लोकाय कर्मणे। इति नु कामयमानः। अथाकामयमानो "योऽकामो निष्काम आप्तकाम आत्मकामो न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति ब्रह्मैव सन्ब्रह्माप्येति। तदेष श्लोको भवति। यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि स्थिताः। अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते॥" बृह. उप. IV. 4. 5–7; the verse यदा सर्वे occurs in कठोपनि०; the भाष्य of शङ्कराचार्य on this begins: स वा अयं य एवं संसरत्यात्मा ब्रह्मैव पर एव।. He distinguishes यथाकारी यथाचारी as 'करणं नाम नियता क्रिया विधिप्रतिषेधादिगम्या चरणं नामानियतामिति विशेषः।'. On क्रतु he says क्रतुर्नामाध्यवसायो निश्चयो यदनन्तरा क्रिया प्रवर्तते।'. आत्मकाम is explained as यस्य आत्मैव नान्यः कामयितव्यो वस्त्वन्तरीभूतः पदार्थो भवति. With कामयमानः and अकामयमानः, compare मुण्डकोप० III. 2.3 (कामान्यः कामयते). The affix मय as in काममय is employed in two senses viz. प्राचुर्य and विकार acc. to पाणिनि 'तत्प्रकृतवचने मयट्' (V. 4. 21 and IV. 3. 134 and 143). The word क्रतु by itself and in compounds like शतक्रतु and सुक्रतु occurs hundreds of times in the Ṛgveda. It is an Indo-European word, as in Greek we have 'Kratos' meaning power. Several meanings have been assigned to क्रतु. Indra called 'Śatakratu' is invoked to bestow *ojas*, courage, an heroic son and stated to be the father and mother of the devotee (in Ṛg. VIII. 98. 10–12). With the Bṛ. Up. passage, we may compare छा. उप. III. 14. 1 'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म तज्जलानिति शान्त उपासीत। अथ खलु क्रतुमयः पुरुषो यथा क्रतुरस्मिँल्लोके पुरुषो भवति तथेतः प्रेत्य भवति। स क्रतुं कुर्वीत।'

2509. Compare Epistle to Galatians by Apostle Paul 6. 7 'whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap'. Even in the Old Testament we find in the Book of Job, chap. 4. 8 'they that plough iniquity and sow wickedness reap the same'. From the question of the disciples of Jesus as regards a man blind from birth 'Master! who did sin, this man or his parents that he was born blind' (St. John IX. 2), it appears that the idea of Karma was prevalent among the Jewish people in the time of Jesus. From Matthew XI. 14 and XVII. 12-13 it appears that John the Baptist was declared to be an incarnation of prophet Elias. Shaw Desmond in 'Re-incarnation for every man' points out (on p. 63) that the doctrine of re-incarnation was taught in the Christian Church in the early centuries and that the 2nd Council of Constantinople in 551 A. D. made the doctrine of re-incarnation an anathema.

(the last results) of whatever deeds he does in this world, he returns again from that world (where he temporarily went by way of reward) to this world of action; so much with regard to him who is consumed by desires; now concerning the man who has no desires (akāmayamāna); he who is without desire, free from desire, in whose case desires are laid to rest, who is himself his own desire, his vital spirits do not withdraw elsewhere but he, being *brahma* itself (here), is absorbed into *brahma* (or attains to *brahma*). On this point there is a verse: 'When all hankerings that found an abode in a man's heart vanish, then he who was liable to death becomes immortal, here (in this body itself) he attains to *brahma*." In the above passage the sequence is: desire, will and act.

About the grandeur of this passage it is enough to quote what Deussen (in 'Philosophy of the Upanishads' p. 348) says 'there follow words than which deeper, truer, more noble were never uttered by human lips.' Vide also remarks of Gerald Heard in 'Is god evident' (Faber and Faber, London) p. 34 'Here (in Vedānta and Mahāyāna) is spirituality showing its full fruits; freedom from physical craving, from economic possessiveness, from social desire for recognition and that triple freedom removing all fear' and he hopes that the Vedānta picture, far from being contradicted, is being increasingly confirmed by modern science.

This sublime passage is preceded and followed by illustrations two of which may be cited for explaining the conception of the passage of the soul from one body to another: 'Just as the caterpillar, having reached the tip of one blade of grass, makes an approach to another blade, draws itself towards it and establishes itself thereon, so this (individual) self, casting down this body in death, dispelling *avidyā* (ignorance) and making approach to another body draws itself to another body and establishes (or identifies itself) therein.' This is Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 3. Another illustration (in Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 7) is 'just as the skin (slough) of a snake lies dead and cast-off in an ant-hill, in the same way the body lies (dead and cast-off) and then the self is bodiless, immortal spirit, is *brahma* only and is light only.'

This whole passage (Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 5–7) is the leading, the oldest and the clearest passage on the doctrine of transmigration in the Upaniṣads. There are several others of similar import. At the end of the story about Yājñavalkya and Ārtabhāga referred to above (where Yājñavalkya discussed with Āratbhāga alone in private the question as to what happens

to a man when the body dies) the Upaniṣad states 'what they said was Karma alone, what they praised was Karma alone viz.[2510] that a man becomes good by good works and evil by evil works.' These two are the fundamental passages which express the reason and motive that lie at the basis of the doctrine of transmigration.

The gist of these two passages is that works and conduct done in this life fashion a man's future life and that the present birth of a man depends on his actions and conduct in a past life or lives. But works and conduct are the result of volition or will and this last is due to desires. A man may have several desires, he may curb some of them, but may make a resolve to consummate some of his desires. Therefore, desires (*kāma*) are the root of volition, of works and conduct and ultimately of the cycle of birth and deaths (that is called 'saṁsāra'). Hence Śaṅkarācārya, following the idea of the verse 'yadā sarve pramucyante kāmā' (in Bṛ. Up. IV. 5. 7) says 'Kāmo mūlam saṁsārasya' (Kāma is the root of saṁsāra).

Then there is another important passage in the Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. There the story is told of Śvetaketu, son of Āruṇi, who being proud of his learning, came to the assembly hall of the Pañcālas and saw there Pravāhaṇa Jaivali (a kṣatriya or prince) being waited upon by servants. When the prince saw him he asked Śvetaketu 'have you been taught by your father'? When Śvetaketu replied 'yes', the prince put to him five questions viz. (1) do you know how men when they depart from this world go in separate (different) directions; (2) Do you know how they come back to this world; (3) Do you know how the yonder world does not become full with many men going there again and again; (4) Do you know at the offering of which oblation waters become endowed with human voice and rise and speak; (5) Do you know the access to the path called 'Devayāna'[2511]

2510. तौ होत्क्रम्य मन्त्रयांचक्राते। तौ ह यदूचतुः कर्म हैव तदूचथुः। अथ यत्प्रशशंसतुः कर्म हैव तत्प्रशशंसतुः। पुण्यो वै पुण्येन कर्मणा भवति पापः पापेनेति। बृह. उप. III. 3.13.

2511. The question about देवयान and पितृयाण is put in the Bṛ. up. VI. 2.2 in the following form; वेत्थो देवयानस्य वा पथः प्रतिपदं पितृयाणस्य वा। यत्कृत्वा देवयानं वा पन्थानं प्रतिपद्यन्ते पितृयाणं वा। अपि हि न ऋषेर्वचः श्रुतम्—द्वे सृती अशृणवं पितॄणामहं देवानामुत मर्त्यानाम्। ताभ्यामिदं विश्वमेजत्समेति यदन्तरा पितरं मातरं च। इति।. The verse द्वे सृती etc. is ऋ. X. 88. 15 (which reads द्वे सृती अशृणवं etc.) and तै. आ. I. 4. 2-3 (which reads सृती...अन्तरापूर्वमपरं च केतुम्). द्यौः (heaven) and पृथिवी are respectively called father and mother in Ṛg. I. 164. 33 and I. 191. 6.,

and to the path called 'Pitṛyāṇa' (i.e. the deeds by which men gain access to the paths called Devayāna ans Pitṛyāṇa), for we have heard the saying of a sage 'I heard two paths for men, one leading to the Fathers and the other leading to the Devas; on those two paths all the world that is active moves on, whatever exists between father (sky) and mother (earth).' To all these five questions Śvetaketu replied that he did not know any one of them. The prince offered hospitality but Śvetaketu ran to his father and demanded how the latter could say that he had been thoroughly-taught by him and that he could not answer even one of the five questions that the fellow of a Rājanya asked. Then the father replied that he had taught all that he knew but he himself did not know the answers to those questions. He went to the prince (kṣatriya) who honoured him with offerings. Āruṇi did not want wealth but the replies to those questions. The prince said 'come as pupil.' Āruṇi (Gautama) stated he came as a pupil. The prince stated that the *vidyā*[2512] that he would teach was never before with any brāhmaṇa. Then he propounds to Śvetaketu the anwers to the five questions (to be brief) viz. that the five fires are (figuratively) heaven, god of rain, the earth, man and woman, and the five *āhutis* (oblations) are śraddhā (faith), Soma (Moon), rain, food and seed. This answers the 4th question. The first and fifth questions are answered by the statement 'Some go by the path of Devas, others by that of *pitṛs* and others (like flies and worms) know no path (they merely live and die)'; vide Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 15–16. The 2nd and 3rd questions are answered by the same viz. those that go by the path of pitṛs return to the earth and others that go to *brahman* do not return and therefore the world does not become full.

In the Ch. Up. V. 3. 2 the questions are put in a slightly different form: (1) do you know to what place men go from here, (2) how they return, (3) do you know where the path of devas and the path of the fathers diverge, (4) why the world never becomes full, (5) why in the 5th oblation water is called 'man.' The answers to these in Bṛ. Up. and Chān. Up. are not identical, though very similar. A fire has five constituents, fuel, smoke, flame, live coals, sparks. In both Chān. Up. V.10.4–9 and Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 9–13 the fires are the same, but the constituents of

2512. This Vidyā is called Pañcāgnividyā. 'Rājanya' in this Upaniṣad passage should mean only Kṣatriya as in the Puruṣasūkta (Ṛg. X. 90. 12) and not king.

each of these five differ slightly; compare, for example, Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 11 with Chān. Up. V. 3. 6. The first question in the Ch. Up. is answered by the mention of the two paths. The 2nd is answered in Chān. Up. V. 10. 3-5.[2513] The paths diverge (3rd question) after reaching the moon (Chān. Up. V. 10. 2 and 4-5), the 4th is answered in Chān. V. 10. 8. The fifth is answered by means of the statement on pañcāgnividyā.

Before proceeding further some remarks are called for about what might possibly happen when a man's body dies. There are mainly three possibilities, viz. (1) annihilation, (2) endless retribution in heaven or hell and (3) punarjanma (transmigration. Those who do not believe in an individual immortal self, including some most eminent[2514] men such as G. B. Shaw, hold the first view and even in ancient India (as the Kaṭhopaniṣad I. 20 testifies) there were people who had doubts about survival after death. Those who hold that there is no survival after death are not troubled by other questions. Therefore, the most vital question is the one about survival after death. The very first verse of Śv. Up. puts forward four problems; is brahma the cause, whence do we come, what sustains us and whither we are going? Many of those who believe in God, heaven and hell do not admit pre-existence of the soul but only post-existence. They believe that if a man leads a virtuous career in this life (and virtue according to them consists in obedience to the will

---

2513. छा. उप. V. 10. 4 'आकाशाच्चन्द्रमसमेष सोमो राजा तद्देवानामन्नं तं देवा भक्षयन्ति' and बृह. उप. VI. 2. 16 ते चन्द्रं प्राप्यान्नं भवन्ति तांस्तत्र देवाः ... भक्षयन्ति. are dealt with in वे. सू. III. 1. 7 (भाक्तं वानात्मवित्त्वात्तथाहि दर्शयति), which states that the words (gods eat them) are not to be taken literally but metaphorically and what is meant is that Gods like the company of those people (who perform sacrifices), since the Chān. Up. itself says elsewhere (in III. 8. 1) that the Gods do neither eat nor drink but they feel satisfied by seeing nectar.

2514. In 'In search of faith', a 'symposium' edited by E. W. Martin (London, 1943) G. B. Shaw states (pp. 9-10) that he may be described as a creative evolutionist, that he does not believe in personal immortality and abhors it, that he does not believe in the Resurrection of Jesus. It is difficult for a non-Christian to state definitely the doctrine as to what happens after death, there being many varying interpretations accepted by the Christian Churh at various times and in different countries. But the general traditional scheme is a particular judgment immediately after death, the general judgment at the general Resurrection- the ultimate issue of judgment being consignment to Hell or admission to Heaven eternally.

of God as disclosed to their intellect in Revelation such as the Bible or the Koran) he would have an eternal life of bliss in heaven and that if one led a life of sin and evil, he would after death remain for ever in hell. Very few accept the first possibility (annihilation) because it is in conflict with man's cherished desires and with deep-rooted emotional certitude that efforts made in a long life, the mental and spiritual equipment acquired cannot have been meant to be dissolved altogether without leaving any trace behind. The 2nd possibility also leads to the prospect of eternal reward or eternal damnation for acts done during a life of a few years' span and becomes unacceptable to many by the unparalleled disproportion between deeds (as causes) and their endless rewards or retribution (as effects). Therefore, to many people the third possibility of transmigration appeals, since it allows continued existence of the soul after physical death in some other forms and environments.

The above Upaniṣad passages are enough to show how the doctrine of transmigration was being moulded in the Upaniṣad period. The Ṛgveda knows the two paths of Devayāna and Pitṛyāṇa and also that in heaven there were joys and delights but the Ṛgveda does not say how long the joys of Heaven were to last and makes no clear and definite statement on the doctrine of transmigration. In the Brāhmaṇa period the two paths were often referred to and the conception had dawned upon the minds of thinkers that man might have to pass through death several times (*punarmṛtyu*). But even then there is hardly any definite theory of punarjanma based on good or bad deeds. The clearest statements (and probably earliest) of the origin of the doctrine of transmigration are the two passages (Bṛ. Up. III. 3. 13 and IV 4. 5-7) in which Yājñavalkya is concerned and is the instructor and emphasizes that it is man's own works and conduct that lead a man to new births. In both those passages the Devayāna and Pitṛyāṇa paths are not mentioned at all. But the Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 16 and Chān. Up. V. 10 relate the two paths to transmigration and speak of a third place for those born as worms and flies. This is an addition to the doctrine of the two paths, but they make a further departure. The Chān. Up. V. 10. 5 states that those that perform sacrifices, works of public utility and charity go to the moon and when the results of their actions are exhausted after staying in the moon they have to return to this world by the path they went (i. e. from the Moon to ether, then to Vāyu, smoke, mist, cloud and rain

and they may be born from a mother's womb.[2515] This shows that a double retribution awaits those who perform sacrifices &c. viz. stay in the moon for a time and their rebirth on this earth. Other Upaniṣads follow the Chān. Up. in the theory of double retribution e.g. the Praśna has the following passage in prose:[2516] "The year indeed is Prajāpati, there are two parts thereof, the southern and the northern. Now those who believe in sacrifice and gifts for public utility as work that must be done, secure the moon only as their (future) world and it is they who return to this world. Therefore, the ṛṣis who desire offspring resort to the southern (path). That path of the Fathers is indeed treasure (or wealth). But those who, after having sought the Ātman by austerities, (sexual) abstinence, faith and knowledge go by the northern path to the Sun. This is the home of the vital spirits, it is immortal, free from fear, it is the highest (or final) end. Thence they do not return, that is a check to other things. On this there is a verse (Ṛg. I. 164. 12) 'some call him the father with five feet (the five seasons) and with twelve forms (twelve months), the giver of rain in the highest of heaven; others again say that the sage is placed in the lower half, in the chariot with seven wheels (horses or rays of sun) and six spokes'". This verse of the Ṛgveda is probably quoted here in support of the conception of the two paths symbolically represented as two parts of the year, as the Ṛg. verse (first half) appears to refer to the Sun, placed in highest half of heaven and as the second half seems to refer to a lower (*upare*) half of heaven with six spokes (i. e. the six months of Dakṣiṇāyana). Deussen (Ph. Up. p. 338) is positive that Ṛg. I. 164. 12 has nothing to do with

---

2515. अभ्रं भूत्वा मेघो भवति मेघो भूत्वा प्रवर्षति। त इह व्रीहियवा ओषधिवनस्पतयस्तिलमाषा इति जायन्तेऽतो वै खलु दुर्निष्प्रपतरम्। यो यो ह्यन्नमत्ति यो रेतः सिञ्चति तद्भूय एव भवति। छा. उप. V. 10. 6; and 8 is अथैतयोः पथयोर्न कतरेण च न तानीमानि क्षुद्राण्यसकृदावर्तीनि भूतानि भवन्ति जायस्व म्रियस्वेति। एतत्तृतीयं स्थानम्। तेनासौ लोको न सम्पूर्यते।. Compare मुण्डक II. 1. 5. शङ्कराचार्य has a very long and interesting note on this passage. He explains दुर्निष्प्रपतरम् in two ways viz. 'दुर्निष्क्रमणं दुर्निःसरणम्।' and again says the word is निष्प्रपततरम् (one त being lost) 'तकार एको लुप्तो द्रष्टव्यः। व्रीहियवादिभावो दुर्निष्प्रपतः। तस्मादपि दुर्निष्प्रपताद्रेतःसिग्देहसम्बन्धो दुर्निष्प्रपततर इत्यर्थः। यस्मादूर्ध्वरेतोभिर्बालैः पुंस्त्वरहितैः स्थविरैर्वा भक्षिता अन्तराले शीर्यन्ते अनेकत्वादन्नादानाम्। कदाचित्काकतालीयवृत्त्या रेतःसिग्भिर्भक्ष्यन्ते।'.

2516. संवत्सरो वै प्रजापतिस्तस्यायने द्वे दक्षिणं चोत्तरं च। तद्ये ह वै तदिष्टापूर्ते कृतमित्युपासते ते चान्द्रमसमेव लोकमभिजयन्ते। त एव पुनरावर्तन्ते तस्मादेत ऋषयः प्रजाकामा दक्षिणं प्रतिपद्यन्ते। एष ह वै रयिर्यः पितृयाणः॥ अथोत्तरेण तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण श्रद्धया विद्ययात्मानमन्विष्यादित्यमभिजयन्ते। एतद्वै प्राणानामायतनमेतदमृतमभयमेतत्परायणमेतस्मान्न पुनरावर्तन्त इत्येष निरोधस्तदेष श्लोकः। पञ्चपादं पितरं ... षडर आहुरर्पितमिति। प्रश्नोप. I. 9-11. पञ्चपादं° is ऋ. I. 164. 12 (उपरे as one word, while प्रश्नोप° reads उ परे separately.)

with the subject (of the two paths). But what is there to prevent an ancient sage of the Upaniṣadic times from holding that the verse in its two halves refers (figuratively or symbolically) to two paths, particularly when even in the Ṛgveda times paths called Devayāna and Pitṛyāṇa were well-known as shown below? It should be noted that in the preceding verse (I. 164. 11) the wheel of ṛta (the year or the sun) is Dvādaśāra (with twelve spokes, viz. months) and therefore when *ṣaḍare* (with six spokes) is mentioned in I. 164. 12 a period of six months could well have been intended or could very well be got by interpretation.

The Kauṣītaki Up. (I. 2–3), however, speaks only of Devayāna and Pitṛyāṇa and has no third place for worms and birds &c. and states (vide n 2520 below) that worms &c. also come to the same world to which men return. Further, the stations of the Devayāna path (Agni, bright half of the month etc.) had been given a counterpart in the Pitṛyāṇa path in the Bṛ. Up. and Chān. Up. which made the moon the point of divergence for the two paths. The Kauṣītaki Up. omits all the preliminary stations up to the moon and brings all transmigrating beings to the moon (in I. 2). There are some other variations also that need not be dwelt upon here.

Deussen (in Ph. Up. p. 318) argues that in the Ṛg. verse (X. 88. 15) the two ways are really to be understood as day and night and he translates that verse as 'I have heard from my forefathers that there are two ways alike for gods and men', thus giving to the world 'pitṛṇām' the sense of the ablative and holding that 'my' is to be understood before pitṛṇām, though not to be understood before the other two words in the genitive in the same verse. The meaning which the Upaniṣad reads in the Ṛg. verse is proper and also the original meaning of the verse. The path called Pitṛyāṇa [2517] is mentioned in Ṛg. X. 2. 7 (Agni knows well the path called pitṛyāṇa) and Ṛg. X. 18. 1 runs 'O Death! Follow another path which is your own and different from Devayāna.' These two verses clearly show that the Ṛgvedic sages had arrived at the conception of paths called Devayāna and Pitṛyāṇa. Therefore, the express mention of two paths in Ṛg. X. 88. 15 in connnection with Pitṛs and Devas should be deemed to refer to Pitṛyāṇa and Devayāna paths and it is far-fetched to take them as day and

---

2517. पन्थामनु प्रविद्वान् पितृयाणं द्युमदग्ने समिधानो वि भाहि। ऋ. X. 2. 7; परं मृत्यो अनु परेहि पन्थां यस्ते स्व इतरो देवयानात्। ऋ. X. 18. 1.

night, which are hardly ever referred to in the Ṛgveda as paths. This verse is explained in the Śat. Br. XII. 8. 1. 21 [2518] (quoted below) which says that the two ways are those of the gods and pitṛs and the commentary of Dvivedagaṅga explains the first half in the same way. Vide also Śat. Br. I. 9. 3. 1–2. Devayāna is sometimes used in the plural in the Ṛgveda (as in III. 58. 5, VII. 38. 8, VII. 76. 2, X. 51. 5, X. 98. 11). In Ṛg. X. 15. 8 Yama is said to enjoy offerings along with the ancient forefathers of the sage and in X. 154. 4 Yama is requested to be united with ancient pitṛs, righteous and full of austerities. The Śat. Br. (XIII. 8. 1. 5) states that the door to the world of the Fathers is in the southwest, while Northeast is the direction of Gods and men (I. 2. 5. 17 and XII. 4. 2. 15). The Atharvaveda (XV. 12. 5.) mentions both Pitṛyāṇa and Devayāna paths. Soma, rain, food, *retas* (semen) may be described as watery, but the question is how the first *āhuti* 'śraddhā' (faith) can be described as an āhuti offered in Agni (viz. the yonder world) by the Gods from which king Soma arises (in Chān. Up. V. 4. 2 and Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 9). This is answered by V. S. [2519] III. 1. 5 and (and at some length) in the Śāṅkarabhāṣya thereon.

The Kausītaki Up. (I) [2520] sets out rather obscurely the doctrine of the two paths as part of the Pañcāgnividyā taught

---

2518. द्वे सृती ... इमिति द्वे वाव सृती इत्याहुर्देवानां चैव पितॄणां चेति। शतपथ. XII. 8. 1. 21; मर्त्यानां मनुष्याणां द्वे सृती द्वौ मार्गौ शुश्रुवानस्मि तयोर्मध्ये एका पितृलोकप्रापिका द्वितीया तु देवलोकप्रापिका। Com. of द्विवेदगङ्ग (Weber's ed. p. 1165); यो यजते सोऽस्यैष यज्ञो देवलोकमेवाभिप्रैति तदनूची दक्षिणा यां ददाति सैति। दक्षिणामन्वारभ्य यजमानः। स एष देवयानो वा पितृयाणो वा पन्थाः। शतपथ *I. 9. 3. 1–2.*

2519. प्रथमेऽश्रवणादिति चेन्न ता एव ह्युपपत्तेः। वे. सू. III. 1. 5; भाष्य 'यदि नाम पर्जन्यादिषूत्तरेषु चतुर्ष्वग्निष्वपां होम्यद्रव्यता परिकल्प्येत परिकल्प्यतां नाम। तेषु होतव्यतयोपात्तानां सोमादीनामब्बहुलत्वोपपत्तेः। प्रथमे त्वग्नौ श्रुतां श्रद्धां परित्यज्याश्रुता आपः परिकल्प्यन्त इति साहसमेतत्। ... नैष दोषः। ... श्रद्धाकार्यं सोमवृष्ट्यादि स्थूलीभवदब्बहुलं लक्ष्यते। सा च श्रद्धाया अप्त्वे युक्तिः। कारणानुरूपं हि कार्यं भवति। श्रद्धाशब्दश्चाप्सूपपद्यते वैदिकप्रयोगदर्शनात्-श्रद्धा वा आपः-इति। तनुत्वं श्रद्धासारूप्यं गच्छन्त्य आपो देहबीजभूता इत्यतः श्रद्धाशब्दाः स्युः।. It may be noted that V. S. III. 1. 1–7 are explanatory of Chān. Up. V. 3. 9 and Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 9–13 and the whole of V. S. III. 1 explains on the basis of Pañcāgnividyā how the self passes through various stages of saṁsāra.

2520. स होवाच ये वै के चास्माल्लोकात्प्रयन्ति चन्द्रमसमेव ते सर्वे गच्छन्ति। तेषां प्राणैः पूर्वपक्ष आप्यायते। तानपरपक्षेण प्रजनयति। एतद्वै स्वर्गस्य लोकस्य द्वारं यच्चन्द्रमाः। तं यः प्रत्याह तमतिसृजते। अथ य एनं न प्रत्याह तमिह वृष्टिर्भूत्वा वर्षति। स इह कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा शकुनिर्वा शार्दूलो वा सिंहो वा मत्स्यो वा परश्वा वा पुरुषो वान्यो वैतेषु स्थानेषु प्रत्याजायते यथाकर्म यथाविद्यम्। कौषी. उप. I. 2: स एतं देवयानं पन्थानमापद्याग्निलोकमागच्छति। स वायुलोकम्। ... ब्रह्मलोकम्। ... *ibid* I. 3; स एष विसुकृतो विदुष्कृतो ब्रह्म विद्वान् ब्रह्मैवाभिप्रैति। *ibid* I. 4.

by Citra Gārgyāyaṇi (v. l. Gāṅgyāyni) to Śvetaketu, son of Āruṇi. It is passed over here for reasons of space and as not of material importance except one passage which runs 'He (Citra) said that all those that depart from this world go to the moon; in the bright half the moon is increased by their spirits, in the dark half the moon sends them on to be born again. The moon is verily the door of the heavenly world. Now if a man disowns the moon (i. e. is dissatisfied with life there) the moon sets him free. But if a man is not dissatisfied then the moon sends him down as rain here (on the earth). And according to his deeds and according to his knowledge he is born again here as a worm, a locust, a bird, a tiger or a lion or a fish, or a snake, as a man or as something else in different places.' Then I. 3 begins by referring to Devayāna and I. 4 ends by saying, 'being freed from good deeds and from evil deeds, he, the knower of brahman, (neuter) moves towards brahman alone.'

In the Kaṭhopaniṣad [2521] Yama tells Naciketas the secret about Brahmavidyā and what the self becomes on the death (of the body) viz. some men go to a mother's womb for an embodied existence while others are transferred into stumps (of trees) according to their deeds and knowlege.

The Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 15-16 and Chān. Up. V. 3. 10 ff deal with the question of those who go by Devayāna and by the Pitṛyāṇa paths. First [2522] the Bṛ. Up. 'Those (even householders) who know this (Pāñcāgnividyā) and also those (hermits and ascetics) who, in the forest being full of faith, worship Truth (Brahman, Hiraṇyagarbha) go to *arcis* (light), from arcis to day (*ahan*) from day to the increasing fortnight (i. e. śukla-pakṣa), from the increasing half to the six months during which the Sun moves in the north, from those six months to the world of the Devas (Devaloka), from the Devaloka to the Sun, from the sun to lightning. When they have reached the place of lightning a

2521. हन्त त इदं प्रवक्ष्यामि गुह्यं ब्रह्म सनातनम्। यथा च मरणं प्राप्य आत्मा भवति गौतम॥ योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते शरीरत्वाय देहिनः। स्थाणुमन्येऽनुसंयन्ति यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम्॥ कठोप. V. 6-7.

2522. ते य एवमेतद्विदुर्ये चामी अरण्ये श्रद्धां सत्यमित्युपासते तेऽर्चिरभिसम्भवन्ति। अर्चिषोऽहः। अह्न आपूर्यमाणपक्षम्। आपूर्यमाणपक्षाद्यान् षण्मासानुदङ्ङादित्य एति। मासेभ्यो देवलोकम्। देवलोकादादित्यम्। आदित्याद्वैद्युतम्। तान् वैद्युतान् पुरुषो मानस एत्य ब्रह्मलोकान् गमयति। ते तेषु ब्रह्मलोकेषु पराः परावतो वसन्ति तेषां न पुनरावृत्तिः। बृह. उप. VI. 2. 15. Compare याज्ञ. स्मृति III. 193-94, which closely follow the above in verse.

person born of the mind (of Brahmā) comes to them and leads them to the worlds of Brahmā. In these worlds they being exalted, dwell for ages and there is no return (to *saṁsāra*) for them. But they who conquer (attain) worlds by sacrifice, charity and austerities go to smoke, from smoke to night, from night to decreasing half (of the month), from decreasing half month to the six month during which the Sun moves in the south, from these months to the world of the fathers, from the world of the fathers to the Moon, having reached the Moon, they become food and then the Devas feed on them there as sacrificers feed on king Soma as it increases and decreases (in a sacrifice). But when this (the result of their works done on earth) is exhausted they return to either (ākāśa), from that to Vāyu, from Vāyu to rain, from rain to the earth; on reaching the earth they become food. They are then again offered into the fire called man, from that (i. e. man) they are born in the fire called woman. These, making efforts to secure worlds (by sacrifices &c.), again and again repeat coming to this world. Those, however, who do not know both these paths, they become (are born as) worms, locusts (or birds) and flies.'

The Chān. Up. V. 10. 1–2 are almost in the same words as Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 15 with a few slight changes viz. Chān. Up. reads 'Śraddhā tapa ityupāsate' and 'from months in the north to the year, from year to the Sun, from the Sun to the Moon, from the Moon to lightning; there is a person who is not human (amānavaḥ' for 'mānasaḥ' of Bṛ. Up.) who leads him to *brahman* &c.; then Chān. Up. V. 10. 3–4 are again the same as Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 16 except that Chān. Up. reads 'those who living in a village practise (a life of) sacrifices, works of public utility (called *pūrta*) and almsgiving, go to smoke', but adds 'these do not reach the year,' and proceeds 'from the months to the world of fathers, from that world to ether, from ether to the moon, this is king Soma that is the food of Gods (i. e. the gods like or love them). Having dwelt there (in the moon) till their works are exhausted, they return by the same way by which they came i. e. to ether, from ether to Vāyu, smoke, mist, cloud. (The persons that had performed sacrifices &c) having become clouds come down as rain, are then born as rice and barley, herbs and trees, sesame and māṣa beans. Escape from that state (to that of human beings) is beset with extreme difficulties. Whoever the beings (cattle or other animals or man) may be that eat the food (into which one has been transformed) and beget offspring he (the transmigrating entity) becomes most like them.'

One of the most important passages in the Upaniṣads on conduct fashioning the life that would follow is the Chān. Up. V. 10. 7-8 which may be rendered as follows:[2523] Those whose conduct has been good will quickly attain some good birth, the birth of a brāhmaṇa, of a kṣatriya or of a vāiśya. But those whose conduct has been evil will quikly attain an evil birth, the birth of a dog or a hog or a *cāṇḍāla*. Those that do not go by either of the two paths become those small creatures (worms, flies &c) that are continually returning and whose destiny may be said to be 'to live and die'. Theirs is a third place (apart from the two paths). Therefore the yonder world does not become full. Hence one should be disgusted (with this Saṁsāra).

It may be stated here that the Bhagavadgītā (VIII. 23-27) also refers to the two paths following one of which a yogin does not return to this world and following the other of which he returns to this world. These are called śukla (bright) and kṛṣṇa (dark) *gati* (in VIII. 26) and śṛti (in VIII. 27). The former is fire, light,[2524] day, the bright half of the month, the six months of the northern path of the sun; those men who have realized *brahman* when going from this world go to brahman (the absolute)'. The latter path is 'smoke, night, the dark half (of the month), the six months of the southern path of the Sun; the yogin reaching the moon-light by that path returns to this world. The Śāntiparva[2525] of the Mahābhārata refers to the northern and southern paths, the latter of which is attained by gifts, study of Veda and sacrifices (as in Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 16 and Chān. Up. V.10. 8). The Yājñavalkya-smṛti[2526] also refers to those

2523. तद्य इह रमणीयचरणा अभ्याशो ह यत्ते रमणीयां योनिमापद्येरन् ब्राह्मणयोनिं वा क्षत्रिययोनिं वा वैश्ययोनिं वाथ य इह कपूयचरणा अभ्याशो ह यत्ते कपूयां योनिमापद्येरन् श्वयोनिं वा सूकरयोनिं वा चण्डालयोनिं वा। अथैतयोः पथोर्न कतरेणचन तानीमानि क्षुद्राण्यसकृदावर्तीनि भूतानि भवन्ति जायस्व म्रियस्वेत्येतत्तृतीयं स्थानं तेनासौ लोको न सम्पूर्यते तस्माज्जुगुप्सेत। छा. उप. V. 10 7-8. अभ्याशो ह is explained as क्षिप्रमेव by शङ्कराचार्य.

2524. It is better to read 'agni-jyotir' (in Gītā VIII. 24) as one word instead of 'agnir jyotir' (as in most editions), because both the Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 15 and Chān Up. V. 10 1 start the Devayāna path with *arcis* and omit Agni.

2525. अवाप्यैतानि कर्माणि वेदोक्तानि धनंजय। दानमध्ययनं यज्ञो निग्रहश्चैव दुर्ग्रहः। दक्षिणेन च पन्थानमर्यम्णो ये दिवंगताः। एतान् क्रियावतां लोकानुक्तवान् पूर्वमप्यहम्॥ उत्तरेण तु पन्थानं नियमाद्यं प्रपश्यसि। शान्तिपर्व 26. 8-10 (Ch. ed. = Cr. ed. App. I, no. 4, Lines 15-19).

2526. एतद्यो न विजानाति मार्गद्वितयमात्मवान्। दन्दशूकः पतङ्गो वा भवेत्कीटोऽथवा कृमिः॥ याज्ञ. III. 197; compare बृह. उप. VI. 2. 16 'अथ य एतौ पन्थानौ न विदुस्ते कीटाः पतङ्गा यदिदं दन्दशूकम्।' and छा. V. 10. 8 अथैतयोः ... तृतीयं स्थानम् quoted in the note. 2523.

paths. In III. 195–196 it mentions the Pitṛyāṇa path, which is very like the one described in Bṛ. Up. VI. 2. 16 (except that Yāj. omits ākāśa) and Chān. Up. V. 10. 3–7 (which mentions more stages than in Bṛ. Up.). Yāj. III. 197 also states that those who do not know any one of these two paths (i. e. do not perform the acts peculiar to those who go by these paths) become snakes, locusts, creeping insects or worms.

The Vedāntasūtra frequently refers to the doctrine of transmigration, but owing to the limits imposed by available space only a few important sūtras and their explanations will be set out here. The three sūtras of V. S. II. 1. 34–36 [2527] are of great importance for the theory of transmigration. An objector says '*to hold that God is the cause of the world does not stand to* reason, for, if it be so, God would be liable to the charges of unequal treatment (or dispensation) and cruelty. He creates some that enjoy extreme happiness (like gods and others), some lead an extremely miserable life such as beasts (of burden &c.) and some like men, who enjoy an intermediate position, secure a modicum of enjoyment. So God may be charged with acting through hatred and love (like ordinary men). God also produces misery and finally destroys all persons. This aspect (of great cruelty) appears abhorrent even to evil men. To this the reply is: if god had created inequality in the world at his sweet will and without regard to any other matter, he might have been liable to the two charges of unequal treatment and cruelty. But God has regard to the righteousness (merit) or otherwise of beings when he produces inequalities among creatures. The position of God should be looked upon like that of rain, which is the common cause (or factor) in the production of crops of rice and barley, but the difference (in quality) between rice and barley is due to the varying potentialities of the seeds. God is the common cause in the creation of beasts, men and gods but the inequalities in these are due to the special potentialities of each. Śaṅkarācārya relies expressly on two Upaniṣad passages viz. Kaus. Up. III. 8 and Bṛ. Up. III. 2. 13 'puṇyo vai puṇyena karmaṇā bhavati pāpaḥ pāpena). The Kauṣ. Up. passage means 'He [2528] (the Absolute Ātman) is not

---

2527. वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये न सापेक्षत्वात् तथाहि दर्शयति। न कर्माविभागादिति चेन्नाना-दित्वात्। उपपद्यते चाप्युपलभ्यते च। वे. सू. II. 1. 34–36

2528. स एष प्राण एव प्रज्ञात्माऽऽनन्दोऽजरोऽमृतः। न साधुना कर्मणा भूयान् नो एवा-साधुना कनीयान्। एष एवैनं साधु कर्म कारयति तं यमेभ्यो लोकेभ्य उन्निनीषते। एष उ एवैनम-साधु कर्म कारयति तं यमधो निनीषते। एष लोकपालः। एष लोकाधिपतिः। एष सर्वेशः। स म

(*Continued on next page*)

exalted by good works nor degraded by evil works, but it is He indeed who inspires (a person) to do good works, whom he wishes to lead high over those worlds and it is he who inspires one to do evil deeds whom he wishes to lead down from these worlds'. It will be noticed that the Kauṣītaki bases the attainment of a higher life (or birth) or a lower life on the quality of men's deeds (just as in Bṛ. Up. III. 2. 13, IV. 4. 5, Chān. Up. V. 10. 7, Praśna 3. 7). The Gītā states 'I treat them the same way (with appropriate fruits) in which they come to (or approach) me.'

Another objection is raised to the above proposition contained in V. S. II. 1. 34. The Upaniṣads often state 'In the beginning there was that only which is one without a second (Chān. Up. VI. 2. 1 sad-eva somyedam agra āsīd-ekam evādvitīyam). Therefore, before creation there was no difference between deeds and so there could have been no inequality among the first created beings dependent on difference in deeds. You may say that after difference in deeds arose God has regard to deeds of men, but all beings created in the beginning must have been alike. To this the reply is that saṁsāra is without beginning (anādi) and that such a conception of the beginninglessness of saṁsāra stands to reason and is supported by (Śruti) texts.

Another discussion on the working of Karma occurs in V.S. II. 3. 41-42.[2529] According to the highest metaphysical doctrine the Ātman is one and all individual selves are really free but they are affected in the empirical state by the *Upādhis* of *buddhi*, *mind* &c. and in that state they are controlled by Īśvara (as Antaryāmin, as Bṛ. Up. III. 7. 23 or Kauṣ. Up. III. 8 says) and they

---

(Continued from last page)

आत्मेति विद्यात्। कौषी. उप. III. 8. मे refers to इन्द्र who in this adhyāya (chapter) expounds *Vidyā* to Pratardana, son of Divodāsa, and asks him to meditate upon Prāṇa who is immortal. The Bṛ. Up. and Chān. Up. passages are quoted above. The Praśna Up. passage is III.7 'अथैकयोर्ध्व उदानः पुण्येन पुण्यं लोकं नयति पापेन पापम्। उभाभ्यामेव मनुष्यलोकम्।'. एकया refers to नाडी. The गीता passage quoted by Śaṅkara is 'ये यथा मां प्रपद्यन्ते तांस्तथैव भजाम्यहम्' IV. II.

2529. परात्तु तच्छ्रुतेः। कृतप्रयत्नापेक्षस्तु विहितप्रतिषिद्धावैयर्थ्यादिभ्यः। वे. सू. II. 3. 41-42; कृतो यः प्रयत्नो जीवस्य धर्माधर्मलक्षणस्तदपेक्ष एवैनमीश्वरः कारयति ततश्चैते चोदिता दोषा न प्रसज्यन्ते। जीवकृतधर्माधर्मवैषम्यापेक्ष एव तत्तत्फलानि विषमं विभजेत्पर्जन्यवदीश्वरो निमित्तत्वमात्रेण। ... अपि च पूर्वप्रयत्नमपेक्ष्येदानीं कारयति पूर्वतरं च प्रयत्नमपेक्ष्य पूर्वमकारय- दित्यनादित्वात्संसारस्येत्यनवद्यम्। शाङ्करभाष्य.

receive the fruits of their good and bad actions through Īśvara who does not act at his sweet will but has regard to good or bad conduct.

A few passages about *karma* and transmigration and stories illustrating how people's minds were affected by them in ancient times may be cited here. The Āp. Dh.[2530] S. provides 'Members of all varṇas (classes) reap (in heaven) highest and measureless happiness by carrying out their prescribed duties; thereafter (i. e. after enjoying happiness in heaven) they return (to this world) on account of the (unenjoyed) residue of the results of their actions and secure birth in an (appropriate) caste (or family), beauty of form, charming complexion, power, mental ability, wisdom, wealth, the (blessing of the) performance of duties and this results in happiness only in both worlds like a wheel. A similar rule applies to the increase of the results of evil acts. The thief of gold, one guilty of brāhmaṇa murder, according as he belongs to the brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya or vaiśya class, after undergoing torments in hell for a limited time becomes respectively a *cāṇḍāla*, *paulkasa* or *vaiṇa*.' The Gautama Dharmasūtra has a passage in very similar words: 'Members of the varṇas (brāhmaṇa and others) and of āśramas (brahmacārin &c) who are devoted to performing the appropriate duties (of their class or stage in life) enjoy the fruit (heaven) of their actions after death and then by virtue of the residue (of their actions) they attain a (new) birth (in this world) endowed with a good country, caste, family, life, learning, character, wealth, mental ability and happiness. Those who act contrary to this are ruined by having to resort to many (evil) births.' On V. S. III. 1. 8 Śaṅkarācārya after quoting Gautama XI. 29 states 'there is no possibility of the destruction of the effect of an evil deed except by some of the methods prescribed by śāstra (such as expiations and realisation of the Absolute) and that it is possible that a good deed may begin to yield its reward

2530. सर्ववर्णानां स्वधर्मानुष्ठाने परमपरिमितं सुखम् । ततः परिवृत्तौ कर्मफलशेषेण जातिं रूपं वर्णं बलं मेधां प्रज्ञां द्रव्याणि धर्मानुष्ठानमिति प्रतिपद्यते तच्चक्रवदुभयोर्लोकयोः सुख एव वर्तते । ... एतेन दोषफलवृद्धिरुक्ता । स्तेनोऽभिशस्तो ब्राह्मणो राजन्यो वैश्यो वा परस्मिँल्लोके परिमिते निरये वृत्ते जायते चाण्डालो ब्राह्मणः पौल्कसो राजन्यो वैणो वैश्यः। आप. ध. सू. II. 1. 2. 2-3, 5-6; वर्णाश्रमाः स्वस्वधर्मनिष्ठाः प्रेत्य कर्मफलमनुभूय ततः शेषेण विशिष्टदेशजातिकुलरूपायुःश्रुतचित्त (वृत्त?) वित्तसुखमेधसो जन्म प्रतिपद्यन्ते । विष्वञ्चो विपरीता नश्यन्ति । गौ. ध. सू. XI. 29-30.

after a long time because it is hampered by the results of an evil deed and quotes a smṛti (Mahābhārata) in support.[2531]

The principle of the doctrine of Karma is that every act, whether good or bad, produces a certain result or return which cannot be escaped. In the physical world there is the universal law of causation. The doctrine of Karma extends this inexorable law of causality to the mental and moral sphere. The doctrine of Karma is not a mechanical law; it is rather a moral or a spiritual necessity. It cannot, however, be said that this doctrine is an induction from observed facts nor can it be asserted that it is experimentally verifiable, but it is only a hypothesis or supposition; it is, however, far better than other naive and childlike theories. In the absense of the theory of karma and rebirth it would have to be assumed that the world is arbitrary, that the Creator is not bound to regard the nature of men's actions but may distribute rewards as he pleases or by caprice. This doctrine of Karma emphasizes three things, firstly it regards an existence as a sort of expiation for the doings of a previous existence or existences; secondly, an evil deed cannot be expiated by works of merit but its punishment must be borne; thirdly, the punishment for wrong is automatic and personal. Under the doctrine of Karma there is no such thing as chance or luck. When we use those words they correspond to no reality and are a tacit confession of our ignorance or inability to state the cause or causes of what has happened. This doctrine of Karma leads on to the doctrine of transmigration. The results of a man's actions may not happen at once or in the present life. The Ādiparva and Manu say[2532] 'an evil deed does not yield its retribution immediately like a a cow (that yields plenty of milk immediately after she is well fed) but returning slowly it cuts off the very roots of the perpe-

---

2531. न हि प्रायश्चित्तादिभिर्हेतुभिर्विना कर्मणामुच्छेदः सम्भाव्यते । स्मृतिरपि विरुद्धफलेन कर्मणा प्रतिबद्धस्य कर्मान्तरस्य चिरमवस्थानं दर्शयति — कदाचित् सुकृतं कर्म कूटस्थमिह तिष्ठति । मज्जमानस्य संसारे यावद् दुःखाद्विमुच्यते ॥ इत्येवंजातीयका । (शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. III. 1. 8). The verse कदाचित्सुकृतं is शान्तिपर्व 290. 18 (Ch. ed. = cr. ed. 279. 17).

2532. नाधर्मश्चरितो लोके सद्यः फलति गौरिव । शनैरावर्तमानस्तु कर्तुर्मूलानि कृन्तति ॥ आदिपर्व 80. 2, मनु IV. 172. गौः may also mean 'the earth.' But in that case the meaning would be 'when you sow seed in the earth it takes time before the crops are ready.' If गौः means 'an ox' (or cow) here, then it would mean an ox is immediately useful for carrying loads unlike adharma or 'a cow yields milk immediately after she is fed well.'.

trator.' Man's actions in past existences determine or fashion the nature of the present existence and the actions in the present existence taken along with the residue of past actions will determine the future existence. This, in short, is the basis of the doctrine of *punarjanma*. The modifications introduced by texts or popular notions will be briefly dealt with later. The theory of rebirth is as logical as any of the hypotheses that hold the field about what happens after physical death of the body. It is certainly as satisfactory as (or rather more satisfactory than) the theory of absolute annihilation after physical death (held by atheists) or the theory of eternal reward or retribution in heaven or hell (for confirmed criminals of one life). The leaders or exponents of almost all religions hold that God is with them and they generally have never seen (up to at least the 19th century A. D.) any good outside their respective Churches. Hinduism of the Upaniṣads and Gītā is the only religion and philosophy that proclaimed thousands of years ago that the man of good deeds is nearest to God on account of his goodness and the man of evil deeds cannot secure divine grace and fellowship, whomsoever he may regard as a prophet or messiah sent by God.

The Vedāntasūtra in III. 1 examines the passages of the Chān. Up. and of the Bṛ. Up. dealing with Pañcāgnividyā. It is not possible to set out in detail the discussions in the bhāṣya of Śaṅkara on the sūtras in V. S. III. 1. Some of the important final conclusions are: The individual self, while passing from one body to another, is accompanied or surrounded by subtle elements (bhūtasūkṣma), that the āhutis are spoken of as 'āpaḥ' (in Chān. Up. V. 9. 1) because the human body is full of fluids in the form of chyle, blood &c., because sacred works like Agnihotra &c. are the causes of a new body after death and in those works the principal materials used (such as Soma juice, ghee, milk) are mainly fluid. In the statement that those who perform sacrifices &c. go to the moon by the Pitṛyāṇa path and that śraddhā is offered as oblation from which Soma that is the food of gods arises, the words 'food of gods' are used in a metaphorical sense (and not in the sense of eating). The souls of sacrificers and the like, after reaching the moon and enjoying the fruits of their good deeds that can be enjoyed in the moon, return to the earth by the way they went but in reverse order of stations for enjoying the fruits of their actions that can only be

enjoyed on the earth.[2533] This combines the idea of a life beyond (often referred to in the Ṛgveda) with the notion of rebirth and offers two prizes for good deeds (viz. reward in heaven and then a rebirth with material well-being and cultural environment, as in Gautama Dh. S. XI. 29 and Gītā VI. 37-45 and there is a double penalty for evil deeds (viz. hell torture and then a despised or low life).

The V. S. (III. 1. 13-17) further explains that all men do not go to the moon, but only those that perform sacrifices &c. and those that do not perform sacrifices or works of public utility but are guilty of evil acts go to the abode of Yama for undergoing tortures of hell [2534] (which are seven, according to V. S. III. 1. 15) and after that they come to the earth. Those who follow the path of faith and austerity go by the Devayāna path (Chān. Up. V. 10. 1 and Muṇḍaka I. 2. 11) and those who perform sacrifices, charity and works of public utility go by the pitṛyāṇa path (Chān. Up. V. 10. 3 and Muṇḍaka I. 2. 10)[2535] and those that do not follow any one of the two have to go to a third place and be born as worms &c. (Chān. Up. V. 10. 8), that when a śruti text like Kauṣītaki Up. (I. 2) states that all those that depart from this world go to the moon, what is meant by 'all' is all those that have the *adhikāra* (capability or fitness) to go to the moon.

There is one word, namely 'saṁsāra', which occurs frequently in the comparatively later literature on Vedānta and Dharmaśāstra but rarely in the Upaniṣads. It means 'passing through a succession or a round or a cycle of births and deaths.' The

---

2533. कृतात्ययेऽनुशयवान् दृष्टस्मृतिभ्यां यथेतमनेवं च । वे. सू. III. 1. 8. अनुशय is explained by शङ्कराचार्य as 'आमुष्मिकफले कर्मजाते उपभुक्तेऽवशिष्टमैहिकफलं कर्मान्तरजातमनुशयस्तद्वन्तोऽवरोहन्तीति ।'. अनुशय means 'residue' here; compare मेघदूत (पूर्व ३०) स्वल्पीभूते सुचरितफले स्वर्गिणां गां गतानां शेषैः पुण्यैर्हृतमिव दिवः कान्तिमत्खण्डमेकम् ॥. This is a fine fancy (उत्प्रेक्षा) based on the doctrine stated in V. S. III. 1. 8.

2534. संयमने त्वनुभूयेतरेषामारोहावरोहौ तद्गतिदर्शनात् । वे. सू. III. I. 13, on which शङ्कराचार्य quotes कठोप. II. 6 'न साम्परायः प्रतिभाति बालं प्रमाद्यन्तं वित्तमोहेन मूढम् । अयं लोको नास्ति पर इति मानी पुनः पुनर्वशमापद्यते मे ॥.'

2535. विद्याकर्मणोरिति तु प्रकृतत्वात् । वे. सू. III. 1. 17; 'तद्य इत्थं विदुः' (छा. V. 10. 1.) इति विद्या तया प्रतिपत्तव्यो देवयानः पन्थाः प्रकीर्तितः । 'इष्टापूर्ते दत्तम्' (छा. V. 10. 3.) इति कर्म तेन प्रतिपत्तव्यः पितृयाणः पन्थाः प्रकीर्तितः । शाङ्करभाष्य.

Kaṭhopaniṣad says [2536] 'that person who has no understanding, who has not controlled his mind, who is always impure, does not attain that (highest) state and undergoes *saṁsāra* (births and deaths)'. The Śv. Up. VI. 16 speaks of the Supreme Spirit as the 'creator and knower of the universe, as self-born, the knower, the destroyer of time, possessing (all) qualities, knowing everything, Lord of Pradhāna, individual souls and the guṇas (sattva, rajas, tamas) and as the cause of release from saṁsāra, of sustaining it and of bondage.' The Maitrāyaṇī Up. I. 4. says 'such being the nature of saṁsāra what is the use of the enjoyment (of pleasures)'. The Muktikā Up. (II. 37) states 'mind is established as the root of the tree of saṁsāra'. The word 'saṁsāra' occurs in the Vedāntasūtra [2537] IV. 2. 8. The Bhagavadgītā mentions the word several times e. g. 'men who have no faith in this way (of life) do not attain to me (Lord Kṛṣṇa) and return to the path of death and transmigration (IX. 3); those whose minds are fixed on me I deliver in no time from the ocean of death and transmigration' (XII. 7). The Manusmṛti employs the word *saṁsāra* frequently e. g. in the table of the subjects to be treated in the Smṛti 'the passing through saṁsāra' is mentioned (in I. 117) and the 12th chap. uses the word often. It is said (in XII. 51) 'the entire saṁsāra of three kinds due to three sorts of Karma affecting all beings has been expounded'. After describing the various characteristics of the three *guṇas*, sattva, rajas and tamas (in XII. 26-29), and the effects of these guṇas (XII. 30-38), Manu states that those in whom sattva, rajas or tamas preponderates respectively become gods, men or lower animals and again divides each of these three classes into lowest, middling and highest (XII. 40-50). Manu uses the word 'saṁsāra' in the plural (in XII. 52, 54, 70) in the sense of '*gati*' or '*yoni*'. In chap. VI. 40-60 Manu first dilates at length on the daily routine of one who has entered on the stage of *sannyāsa*, what he should wear and carry, how he should maintain himself, how he should restrain

---

2536. यस्त्वविज्ञानवान्भवत्यमनस्कः सदाऽशुचिः । न स तत्पदमाप्नोति संसारं चाधिगच्छति ॥ कठ III. 7; the words तत्पदं refer to कठ II. 15-16; स विश्वकृद्विश्वविदात्मयोनिर्ज्ञः कालकालो गुणी सर्वविद्यः । प्रधानक्षेत्रज्ञपतिर्गुणेशः संसारमोक्षस्थितिबन्धहेतुः । श्वेताश्व॰ VI. 16.

2537. तदापीतेः संसारव्यपदेशात् । वे. सू. IV. 2.8; the शाङ्करभाष्य on this quotes कठ V. 7 as the basis of the use of the word संसार 'योनिमन्ये ... यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम्' ॥ q. above in n. 2521.

his senses and give up love and hate and practise *ahiṁsā* and then proceeds 'he should ponder over the destinies of men due to bad deeds, falling in hell and the tortures of hell, separation from loved ones and contact with undesirable persons, the ravages of old age and the pains of diseases, the departing from the body and again lying in the womb and the passage of the soul through thousands of crores of births of all sorts.' It is entirely wrong to suppose (as done by Mr. Sanjana on p. 10 of his 'Dogma of reincarnation') that Manu prescribes that 'each ego has to go through ten thousand millions of existences.' Manu nowhere says so. All that he means is that the Sannyāsin desirous of liberation should revolve in his mind the possibility of some souls having to migrate through millions of births. Yāj. (in III. 169) employs the verb 'saṁsarati' in the sense of 'undergoes births' and states 'The fruition of actions done by some men results after death (in other bodies) or in this very life (as in the case of Kārīrī sacrifice) and in some cases either in this world or the next (i. e. there is no hard and fast śāstra rule that fruits of actions result immediately after they are done); it also states in a fine simile [2538] 'just as an actor, when acting different parts, colours his body in different colours (fair, dark, brown), so the soul assumes various forms (as short, hunchback, &c.), assumes different bodies due to the various acts done by it. In Yāj. III. 140 the word saṁsāra itself occurs 'The soul affected by (or under the influence of) *rajas* and *tamas*, wandering in this world and coming in contact with undesirable objects (or mental attitudes) goes through transmigration (i. e. assumes various bodies)'. This is in reply to the question in Yāj. III. 129 (Īśvaraḥ sa katham bhāvairaniṣṭaiḥ samprayujyate). The Śāntiparva [2539] remarks 'there is no doubt that in life there is far more misery than happiness'. The Purāṇas often harp on the theme that saṁsāra is impermanent, abounds in sorrows and is fragile like a plantain leaf (e. g vide the Brahmapurāṇa 'saṁsāre..., anitye duḥkhabahule kadalīdalasannibhe' (178. 179). The present writer cannot help feeling that this view of the thorough miserableness of life has been so much and so persistently dinned into the ears of common people not only by

---

2538. विपाकः कर्मणां प्रेत्य केषांचिदिह जायते । इह वामुत्र वैकेषां भावस्तत्र प्रयोजनम् ॥ यथा हि भरतो वर्णैर्वर्णयत्यात्मनस्तनुम् । नानारूपाणि कुर्वाणस्तथात्मा कर्मजास्तनूः ॥ याज्ञ. III. 133, 162; the words नानारूपाणि कुर्वाणः may be construed with भरतः also.

2539. सुखाद्बहुतरं दुःखं जीविते नास्ति संशयः । स्निग्धस्य चेन्द्रियार्थेषु मोहान्मरणमप्रियम् ॥ शान्तिपर्व 205. 6 (= Cr. ed. 198 lines 11–12).

much of Sanskrit literature but also by medieval saints like Tukaram (who says 'happiness is as little as a grain of barley while misery is as big as a mountain') that people have lost zest in life, are unable to put their heart and soul and serious efforts for improving their own lot and the lot of others. It cannot be denied that in India the doctrine of Karma, instead of being a powerful means of urging all men to put great efforts in doing good deeds and a gospel of hope, became in the minds of many confused with fatalism, which led men to become feeble, submissive and disinclined to work hard.

All the above discussion in the Upaniṣads about transmigration of the individual self are valid and concerned with the empirical or phenomenal world (saṁsārāvasthā or vyavahārāvasthā) but considered from the highest metaphysical standpoint of thorough-going *advaita* (the parā vidyā of Muṇḍaka I. 1. 5-6 or *amūrta brahma* of Bṛ. Up. II. 3. 5-6) it falls to the ground, since the individual self is non-different from the Absolute *Brahman*. Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. II. 3. 30 emphasizes this point. He states: As long as the individual self is in *saṁsāra* state and has not attained perfect knowledge and brought the empirical or phenomenal state to an end, so long the connection of the self with *buddhi* does not cease. As long as this connection with *buddhi* (a limiting adjunct) lasts, so long lasts the state of being an individual self merged in saṁsāra. But the real truth is that there is no entity called *jīva* by itself except in so far as it is fictitiously hypostatized by *buddhi*, the limiting adjunct. For, when we determine the real meaning of Vedānta texts, we find no intelligent substance other than the one omniscient Lord whose nature is eternal freedom. Then Śaṅkarācārya cites certain texts (viz. Bṛ. Up. I. 4. 7, III. 7-13, Chān. Up. VI. 1. 6, VI. 8. 7 [2540] and remarks that there are

---

2540. यावदात्मभावित्वाच्च न दोषस्तद्दर्शनात् । वे. सू. II. 3. 30; यावदयमात्मा संसारी भवति यावदस्य सम्यग्दर्शनेन संसारित्वं न निवर्तते तावदस्य बुद्ध्या संयोगो न शाम्यति। यावदेव चायं बुद्ध्युपाधिसम्बन्धस्तावज्जीवस्य जीवत्वं संसारित्वं च परमार्थतस्तु न जीवो नाम बुद्ध्युपाधिसम्बन्धपरिकल्पितस्वरूपव्यतिरेकेणास्ति । न हि नित्यमुक्तस्वरूपात्सर्वज्ञादीश्वरादन्यश्चेतनो धातुर्द्वितीयो वेदान्तार्थनिरूपणायामुपलभ्यते। नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा श्रोता मन्ता विज्ञाता (बृ. III. 7. 23), नान्यदतोऽस्ति द्रष्टृ श्रोतृ मन्तृ विज्ञातृ (छा. VI. 8. 7.), तत्त्वमसि (छा. VI. 1. 6.), अहं ब्रह्मास्मि (बृ. I. 4. 7.) इत्यादिश्रुतिशतेभ्यः । ... अपि च मिथ्याज्ञानपुरःसरोऽयमात्मनो बुद्ध्युपाधिसम्बन्धः । न च मिथ्याज्ञानस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानादन्यत्र निवृत्तिरस्तीत्यतो यावद् ब्रह्मात्मतानवबोधस्तावदयं बुद्ध्युपाधिसम्बन्धो न शाम्यति। शाङ्करभाष्य. Similarly on वे. सू. I. 1. 5. शाङ्करभाष्य says 'सत्यं, नेश्वरादन्यः संसारी, तथापि देहादिसङ्घातोपाधिसम्बन्ध इष्यत एव, घटकरकगिरिगुहाद्युपाधिसम्बन्ध इव व्योम्नः'

hundreds of such texts. Śaṅkarācārya states that even Bādarāyaṇa, the author of the Vedāntasūtras, composed some sūtras from the highest *advaita* standpoint and some from the empirical standpoint. In the following sūtras of V. S. Bādarāyaṇa is obliged to differentiate Jīva and Paramātman I. 1. 16–17; I. 1. 21, I. 2. 20, I. 3. 5, II. 1. 21–23, II. 3. 21. II. 3. 41, II. 3. 43 &c. But the sūtras I. 1. 33, II. 1. 14, IV. 13 indicate that there is non-difference between the two.[2541]

The theory of transmigration postulates that each life is the result or fruit of the actions of the preceding existence or existences. It follows from this that if we go backwards far enough, no existence or birth can be the first. Therefore, the Vedāntasūtra had to declare (in II. 1.35 quoted in n. 2527 above) that saṁsāra is *anādi* (beginningless). But this is in conflict with many passages of the Upaniṣads, which, in speaking of creation, employ the words ' in the beginning ' (as in Chān. Up. VI. 2.1, Bṛ. Up. I. 4., 1, 10 and 17, V. 5.1, Tai. Up. II. 7. 1). In order to get over this conflict the conception of the recurring creation of the universe periodically from all eternity was postulated by means of the machinery of kalpas,[2542] which provides that the universe created by *brahman* persists through a vast period called Kalpa, after the lapse of which it is absorbed into brahman. Vide Śāntiparva 231. 29–32 (Ch. ed. = cr. ed. 224. 28-31). It is stated in the Gītā VIII. 17–19 that the day of Brahmā is equal to one thousand yugas (four yugas make one unit or Mahāyuga) and the night of Brahmā is also of the same duration. All objects spring up from Prakṛti at the advent of the day of Brahmā and at the advent of night are absorbed (or merged) in the Prakṛti. Vide Bhagavadgītā IX. 7 also ' at the end of a Kalpa all elements (or beings) pass into prakṛti over which I preside; but when the next Kalpa starts I send them forth '.

The reasoning is; just as we cannot decide which comes first, the seed or sprouting plant, so it is impossible to say which

---

2541. तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः। वे. सू. II. I. 14; सूत्रकारोपि परमार्थाभिप्रायेण तदनन्यत्वमित्याह व्यवहाराभिप्रायेण तु स्याल्लोकवदिति महासमुद्रस्थानीयतां ब्रह्मणः कथयति। अप्रत्याख्यायैव कार्यप्रपञ्चपरिणामप्रक्रियां चाश्रयति सगुणेषूपासनेषूपयोक्ष्यत इति। शाङ्करभाष्य at end; ' भोक्त्रापत्तेरविभागश्चेत्स्याल्लोकवत् '–this is वे. सू. II. 1. 13.

2542. The one thousand Mahāyugas constituting a day of Brahmā are called a Kalpa. For detailed treatment of Kalpa, Manvantara, Mahāyuga and Yuga, vide pp. 686–697 above. The ancient Upaniṣads have not elaborated this theory of Kalpas &c.

comes first (body or Karma), since no body is possible without Karma (deeds) and no deeds are possible without a body. The Chān. Up. (V.13·2) states "that Being (deity) that had produced fire, water, and earth thought 'let me enter those three beings (fire, water and earth) with this living self and then develop names and forms." That shows that Jīva (the self) was there at the time of creation and thereby indicates that saṁsāra is beginningless. The Ṛgveda in X. 190.3, expressly says 'the creator arranged (or created) as before.'[2542a] Similarly, the Gītā (15.3) states 'the real form of it (of the tree of saṁsāra) is not thus perceived, nor its end nor beginning nor its support; having cut off this deeply rooted Aśvattha (pippala) tree with the powerful sword of non-attachment, that place must be sought for from which those who have reached it do not again return'. The Smṛti verses relied upon by Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. 1.3.30 are noted below.[2543]

2542a. It is possible that the words 'dhātā yathāpūrvamakalpayat' (in Rg. X. 190.3) simply mean that the Creator arranged the Sun, the Moon, Heaven, Earth and regions according to the priorities (or their proper order). But it cannot be gainsaid that these words are at least the germs of the later doctrine of Kalpa, Manvantara & c. Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. I. 3.30 explains the Ṛgveda verse as 'the creator created in the present Kalpa the universe including the Sun and the Moon in the same way as in the preceding Kalpa.' यथा पूर्वस्मिन्कल्पे सूर्याचन्द्रमःप्रभृति जगत् क्लृप्तं तथास्मिन्नपि कल्पे परमेश्वरोऽकल्पयदित्यर्थः. *He quotes as supporting his views several smṛti verses which occur in the* Mahābhārata and in some of the Purāṇas. The present writer feels that it is difficult to hold that a mere illustration or analogy (of seed and tree) can amount to a logical argument. At the most an illustration may lend some plausibility to a theory, belief or conclusion.

2543. The verses quoted by Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. I. 3. 30 as smṛtis are;

(1) तेषां ये यानि कर्माणि प्राक्सृष्ट्यां प्रतिपेदिरे। तान्येव ते प्रपद्यन्ते सृज्यमानाः पुनः पुनः॥ शान्तिपर्व 232. 16. (ch. ed. = cr. ed. 224. 47), वायु 8.32 and 9. 57, विष्णु I. 5. 60, कूर्म I. 7. 64-65, मार्कण्डेय 45.39.

(2) हिंस्राहिंस्रे मृदुक्रूरे धर्माधर्मावृतानृते। तद्भाविताः प्रपद्यन्ते तस्मात्तत्तस्य रोचते॥ शान्ति 232. 17 (Ch. ed. = cr. ed. 224. 48), वायु 8. 33, 103. 33, मनु I. 29, विष्णु I. 5. 61, कूर्म I, 7. 65, मार्कण्डेय 45. 40.

(3) ऋषीणां नामधेयानि याश्च वेदेषु दृष्टयः। शर्वर्यन्ते प्रसूतानां तान्येवैभ्यो ददात्यजः॥ वायु 9. 64, मार्कण्डेय 45. 43. शर्वरी here refers to night of ब्रह्मा.

(4) यथर्तुष्वृतुलिङ्गानि नानारूपाणि पर्यये। दृश्यन्ते तानि तान्येव यथा भावा युगादिषु॥ शान्ति 210.17 (=cr. ed. 203.15), मार्कण्डेय 45. 44, वायु 9. 65, विष्णु I. 5. 65. This verse is quoted without name in the तन्त्रवार्तिक p. 202 on Jai. I. 3. 7; compare मनु I. 30.

(5) यथाभिमानिनोऽतीतास्तुल्यास्ते सांप्रतैरिह। देवा देवैरतीतैर्हि रूपैर्नामभिरेव च॥

The Bhagavadgītā (VI. 37–45) is very emphatic that no exertions made by a man on the path of Yoga with faith are lost even if he does not quickly attain perfection. Lord Kṛṣṇa replies (VI. 40 ff) that such a man failing to secure perfection does not come to an evil end, but he attains to the worlds of the righteous, dwells there for many years, is born in the houses of prosperous and pure men or is born in the family of wise yogins, where he *regains the mental impressions of his past lives.* He makes fresh efforts to gain perfection and is carried forward irresistibly by his practice in former lives and being free from all sins and perfecting himself through many lives attains the highest goal. In the Gītā, Kṛṣṇa says (in IV. 5) 'many are my lives that are past and thine also. All of them I know but thou knowest them not.' In many places the Gītā touches upon the doctrine of transmigration (such as in II. 12–13 and 22–27, IV. 8–9, VII. 19, VIII. 6, 15–16, IX. 21).

In chapters 30-32 (of ch. ed.) of Vanaparva there is a dialogue between Draupadī and Yudhiṣṭhira, who, having lost his kingdom in gambling with the Kauravas, was in exile and hard pressed. Draupadī wonders how such a straightforward, mild, benevolent and truthful prince allowed his mind to be involved in gambling (30. 19), that God does not act towards beings like a father or mother, but He appears to be irascible like a common man, when she sees that honourable men of high character have difficulties in maintaining themselves and dishonourable men live in pleasures (30. 38–39); she proceeds 'human beings,[2544] ignorant and having no control over happiness and misery, go to heaven or hell at the caprice of God.' Yudhiṣṭhira warns her that she talks like an atheist, that he performed no deed with the thought of seeking the reward thereof, that he made gifts and performed sacrifices because he held that it was his duty to do so.' He asked her to give up atheistic talk and not to disrespect Highest God. Then Draupadī came round and replied that she did not mean to disrespect or censure Dharma, that it is far from her thoughts to show disrespect to God, but that, being distressed, she talked like an atheist. She then enters upon a discussion[2545] about

2544. अज्ञो जन्तुरनीशोयमात्मनः सुखदुःखयोः। ईश्वरप्रेरितो गच्छेत्स्वर्गं नरकमेव च॥ वन० 30. 28; this is द्रौपदी's lament.

2545. तथैव हठदुर्बुद्धिः शक्तः कर्मण्यकर्मकृत्। आसीत न चिरं जीवेदनाथ इव दुर्बलः। अकस्मादिह यः कश्चिदर्थं प्राप्नोति पूरुषः। तं हठेनेति मन्यन्ते स हि यत्नो न कस्यचित्॥ ... एवं

(*Continued on next page*)

what people mean by *diṣṭa* (fate) or *haṭha* (chance) or nature (*svabhāva*) and winds up by saying that whatever a person gains is all the result of deeds in past lives.

It is not necessary to say here anything about human effort (*puruṣakāra*) and *daiva*. That topic has been dealt with and the different views of ancient and medieval writers about the respective spheres of these two have been pointed out in H. of Dh. vol. III. pp. 168–170 and notes 214–216.

When the son of Gautamī, who was an old woman that had attained control of mind, died by snake-bite, a hunter caught the snake, brought it bound to Gautamī and said that he would kill the snake for having bitten an innocent and unoffending boy. Gautamī dissuades him from killing the snake by stating 'by killing the snake my son would not be brought back to life, I see no good in killing the snake.' Then Kāla came forward and explained 'Just as a potter moulds from a lump of clay whatever he desires, so man secures fruits of deeds done by himself; the boy's death was due to his deeds in a former life' and Gautamī agreed that her son died by his own deeds in a previous life and that her bereavement by the death of her son was due to her own former deeds.[2546] This story occurs in the very first chapter of the Anuśāsanaparva.

Draupadī who had to work as Sairandhrī (a maid servant) in the harem of Virāṭa bewails before Bhīma 'in my girlhood I must have done something which displeased the Creator *by virtue of which I have been reduced to this distressing condition.*'[2547] The Anuśāsanaparva states 'just as the calf finds

---

(*Continued from last page*)

हठाच्च दैवाच्च स्वभावात्कर्मणस्तथा। यानि प्राप्नोति पुरुषस्तत्फलं पूर्वकर्मणाम्॥ वनपर्व 32. 15–16, 20. नीलकण्ठ explains हठवादिकः as 'प्राग्जन्माभावादकृतमेवोपस्थास्यतीति वदन् चार्वाकः।.'

2546. यथा मृत्पिण्डतः कर्ता कुरुते यद्यदिच्छति। एवमात्मकृतं कर्म मानवः प्रतिपद्यते॥ नैव कालो न भुजगो न मृत्युरिह कारणम्। स्वकर्मभिरयं बालः कालेन निधनं गतः। मया च तत्कृतं कर्म येनायं मे मृतः सुतः। यातु कालस्तथा मृत्युर्मुञ्चार्जुनक पन्नगम्। अनुशासन I. 74, 78–79.

2547. नूनं हि बालया धातुर्मया वै विप्रियं कृतम्। यस्य प्रसादाद्दुर्नीतं प्राप्तास्मि भरतर्षभ॥ विराटपर्व 20. 14. She implies that she does not remember having done any wrong. यथा धेनुसहस्रेषु वत्सो विन्दति मातरम्। एवमात्मकृतं कर्म कर्तारमनुगच्छति॥ अनुशासन 7. 22 = पद्म II. 81. 47 (तथा शुभाशुभं कर्म), 94. 17 (तद्वच्छुभाशुभं कर्म). This verse is quoted in an English translation by A. G. Hogg in 'Karma and redemption' (ed. of 1910 p. 19) and by M. Macnicol in 'Indian Theism' (Oxford Uni. Press, 1915) p. 224

its own mother from among thousands of cows, so *karma* done in a previous life pursues the doer of it.' The Āśvamedhika-[2548] parva asserts that there is no destruction of good and evil actions; they ripen and produce results when the self passes from one body to another. The Sāntiparva (cr. ed. 316. 25 and 35 = ch. ed. 329. 25, 35) avers 'a man by performing good deeds secures the state of a god, he is reborn as a human being by actions of a mixed character (good and evil both) and he is born as lower (than man) by evil deeds; when you (yourself) start after death no one will follow you; only your good or evil deeds will follow you when you leave this world.'

All strata of Hindu society were permeated by the theory of Karma and transmigration. Great Sanskrit poets often allude to it. In the Raghuvaṁśa XI. 22 describing the visit of Rāma to the hermitage of Vāmana pointed out by Viśvāmitra, Kālidāsa remarks 'Rāma became restless (or disturbed) in mind, though not remembering his actions in the former existence as Vāmana' (both Vāmana and Rāma being avatāras of Viṣṇu). Similarly, in Śākuntala (Act V) the poet remarks 'when on seeing charming sights and hearing pleasing words, a person, though surrounded by pleasures, becomes restless (or sorrowful), that is indeed due to this that his mind unconsciously has the impressions of loves and friendships of past lives presented to it'. In the seventh Act of the same play when Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā were re-united, she, referring to her previous rejection by the king, remarks[2549] 'indeed at that time some (bad) actions of mine (in some former life) hampered my good deeds and became ripe for fruition'. In the Raghuvaṁśa the 14th canto contains at first a message of spirited protest by Sītā whom Rāma ordered Lakṣmaṇa to abandon near Vālmīki's hermitage on account of the scandal about her among common people, but afterwards qualifies the message by saying that the terrible misfortune that she was going to suffer was the fruition of her misdeeds in former existences and that she desired to be his wife in a future existence but without separation from him. Vide also the Meghadūta verse quoted above in note 2533 p. 1563.

2548. शुभानामशुभानां च नेह नाशोस्ति कर्मणाम्। प्राप्य प्राप्यानुपच्यन्ते क्षेत्रं क्षेत्रं तथा तथा। आश्वमेधिक 18. 1.

2549. नूनं मे सुचरितप्रतिबन्धकं पुराकृतं तेषु दिवसेषु परिणामसुखमासीत्। शाकुन्तल VII; ममैव जन्मान्तरपातकानां विपाकविस्फूर्जथुरप्रसह्यः॥ साहं तपः सूर्यनिविष्टदृष्टिरूर्ध्वं प्रसूतेश्चरितुं यतिष्ये। भूयो यथा मे जननान्तरेपि त्वमेव भर्ता न च विप्रयोगः॥ रघुवंश 14. 62 and 66.

Many questions naturally arise on the doctrine of Karma and transmigration. One of them is discussed by the bhāṣya of Vyāsa on Yogasūtra II. 13. In Yogasūtra II. 3 five *kleśas* (hindrances) such as *avidyā* (nescience) are enumerated and it is stated (II. 13) that these *kleśas* lead on to fruition of actions by way of birth, life (long or short), kind of experience. Actions (Karma) are of four sorts according to Yogasūtra (IV. 7) viz. *kṛṣṇa* (dark found in wicked people), (2) *śuklakṛṣṇa* (white-dark) that are accomplished by external means in which there is some injury to or benefit of others; (3) *śukla* (white) belonging to those who engage in *tapas*, svādhyāya (study of the sacred texts) and contemplation; because this kind of deed depends on the mind alone and does not depend on external means and does not involve injury to others; (4) *Aśuklākṛṣṇa* (neither white nor dark), which is found in sannyāsins (ascetic saints) whose hindrances (avidyā &c) have dwindled and whose bodies are the last (they will have). Of these four kinds, the yogin alone has non-white karma since he has renounced the fruit of all actions (even of good ones) and he has *akṛṣṇa* since he will never resort to dark actions. The bhāṣya on Yogasūtra II. 13 states four questions, (1) whether one Karma is the cause of one birth, or (2) whether one Karma is the cause of more births than one; (3) whether more than one Karma brings about more births than one; (4) whether more than one Karma brings about one birth. The bhāsya raises objections to the first three and states that the fourth alternative alone is acceptable. Vide p. 1417 note 2325 for the text of the Yogabhāṣya on these four alternatives. The Śāntiparva (chap. 273. 33–34 of cr. ed. =chap 280. 33–34 of ch. ed.) mentions individual souls as of six colours viz. *kṛṣṇa* (dark), *dhūmra* (grey), *nīla* (blue), *rakta* (red), *hāridra* (yellow) and *śukla* (white) in an ascending order, the dark being the lowest and *śukla* being the highest and verses 36–46 describe these six in detail.

There are several features of our present life that can be more satisfactorily explained on the theory of transmigration than on any other. Why do two people who have seen but little of one another feel friendship or hatred? The surmise that in past existences they were friends or had obliged each other or harmed each other offers an explanation. The doctrine of karma and transmigration accounts for the apparently unmerited misery and suffering of many people, while some enjoy undeserved happiness or a good life. Our sense of fairness and justice would

be shocked by the inequalities in the world, if such a doctrine were not there. The hypothesis and belief that all human volition and conduct will suitably be rewarded and punished in subsequent existences has an important bearing on present conduct, would act as an urge to continual effort for goodness in this life and is likely to deter men from vice and cruelty. This doctrine of karma not only offers an explanation about the varying degrees of happiness and unhappiness among human beings, but also accounts for differences in material well-being and unhealthy bodily conditions. It offers a solution of the problem of evil in the world and explains precocious abilities in mathematics, music and arts among children and grown up men as in the case of Ramanujan about whom Prof. Hardy of Cambridge (in 'Ramanujan,' Cambridge, 1940) says that he was the most romantic figure in the recent mathematics. If rightly understood, it is not pessimistic or fatalist, but rather emphasizes all out human effort in this life. It will be seen how many of the works on Dharmaśāstra or connected with it as sources emphasize effort (puruṣakāra) as against views of various people that it is *Daiva* or *Svabhāva* or time or the combination of all these that yield rewards or retribution in this life. It also explains sudden accession of prosperity or high position such as, for example, a poor man's son being adopted by a prince or queen and then becoming an enlightened and famous ruler as was the case with the late Sayajirao Maharaj Gaikwad of Baroda.

Even from Upaniṣadic times various views were held about the origin of the world and similar questions. The Śv. Up. (I. 1) asks the question 'Is *brahma* the cause? Whence are we born? Whereby do we live and whither are we going? Tell us, O knowers of *brahman*, under whose control do we abide in pain or pleasure'? The next verse states 'Should Time or nature or necessity or chance or the elements be considered as the cause or He who is (called) Puruṣa? It cannot be their combination either, since even the self has no power over happiness and misery.' Then verse 3 (latter half) states 'He being one superintends (or controls) all causes viz. Time, self and the rest.' Yāj. I. 350 refers to five views on the question as to what causes desirable or undesirable results viz. some hold that it is *Daiva* alone, some put forward Svabhāva (nature), some rely on Time, some on human effort and some on a combination of all these; but, Yājñavalkya's own view (I. 349, 351) is that

good or bad results are due to *daiva* and *puruṣakāra* and that the former is nothing but effort of former existences that has begun to manifest results. The Śāntiparva (chap. 238. 4–5 = cr. ed. 230. 4–5) refers to the fact that there are three views viz. either human effort or *daiva* or *svabhāva* being the cause, but its own view appears to be that Purusākāra and Daiva combine to produce fruits. The Matsyapurāna (221. 8) asserts that *daiva*, effort and *kāla* working together produce the fruits of actions. The Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa (II. 8. 61-62) refers to three views viz. Daiva, effort and Svabhāva are put forward as causes separately but its own view is that daiva and effort together yield fruits.

It may be stated here that Karma is put in three groups viz. *sañcita*, *prārabdha* and *kriyamāṇa* (or sañciyamāna). The first is the total accumulated deeds of all past existences, the fruits of which have not been experienced. The *prārabdha* Karma is that which was the strongest among the group of *sañcita* deeds just before the present existence of a person begins and which is supposed to determine one's present existence. What a person accumulates during the present existence is called *kriyamāṇa* (or *sañciyamāna*, being collected) and the next existence is determined by the strongest (or the earliest according to some) among the sañcita and kriyamāṇa deeds put together. As the *karmans*[2550] are of different characters and yield different consequences (heaven in case of *sāttvika* deeds, or the earth or mid-regions when they are mainly *rājasa*), and places of tortures when deeds are mainly tāmasa the existences (or births or bodies) differ and the self being affected by the body, the individual souls appear as different. The objection is raised that freedom of will is the basis of all ethical values and that if a man's Karma in past lives determines the present life, then a man in the present life is merely a toy in the power of Karma and has no power to do as he sees best. The question about a man's freedom of will is a most thorny one, on which the greatest thinkers from ancient times to the present day have differed[2551] and no

---

2550. Vide विज्ञानदीपिका of पद्मपाद verses 5 and 8. 'कर्मणां फलवैचित्र्याद्वैचित्र्यं जन्मनामिह । देहवैचित्र्यतो जीवे वैचित्र्यं भासते तथा ॥ सञ्चितं चीयमानं च प्रारब्धं कर्म तत्फलम् । क्रमेणावृत्तिरेतेषां पूर्वं बलवतोऽपि वा ॥'. The com. explains सञ्चितानां शुभाशुभकर्मणां मध्ये यस्य पूर्वकालिकत्वं तस्य पूर्वं प्रारम्भः । तत्समासौ तदनन्तरजातस्यैवं वा क्रमेणावृत्तिः । अपि च सञ्चितकर्मणां मध्ये पौर्वापर्यमनपेक्ष्य यस्य कर्मणो बलवत्तरत्वं तस्यैव पूर्वं प्रारम्भः ।

2551. Jeans in 'Mysterious Universe' (p. 30) observes 'And if Time is so fundamental that an understanding of its true nature is forever beyond our reach, then so also in all probability is a decision the age-long controversy between determinism and free will.'

satisfactory reply can be given. There are numerous works on discussions on Free will and Determinism such as Rashdall's 'Theory of good and evil' vol. II. pp. 302-355 (1907) on 'Free Will,' Bergsons's 'Time and Free will,' Viscount Samuel in 'Belief and action' pp. 303-320; but the present author does not propose to recommend any of these books to the reader of this volume. But if the reader wants a small book on the Free Will controversy he may read the book by M. Davidson (London, 1942). So far as the Indian doctrine of Karma is concerned, it appears that freedom of will is postulated for a man during the present existence to lead a good moral life and perform meritorious acts subject to the limitations caused by the environment in which the present existence is cast. The important working belief is that one has free will and that one is free in the present existence to mould the future (so far as he is concerned) by means of meritorious works. This is the message of the Śāntiparva.[2552] Lord Kṛṣṇa, after a long discourse in the Bhagavadgītā gives Arjuna permission to do as the latter likes (18.63 'yathecchasi tathā kuru'). In Gītā 9.30 also Lord Kṛṣṇa says 'if even a person of the vilest conduct worships me with undivided devotion, he must be held to be righteous, for he has made a right resolve.' Similarly, in VI. 5 the Gītā provides 'let a man lift himself higher by himself, let him not degrade himself; for the self alone is the friend of the self and the self alone is the enemy of the self'. Vide notes below for Upaniṣad passages, V. S. and Śaṅkarabhāṣya. It is possible to accept, on the ancient Indian doctrine, both predestination and free will, the first so far as one's being born in a certain environment is concerned and the 2nd so far as one's actions in the present life are concerned. The Bhagavadgītā (VI. 5-6) holds out the hope even to a sinner that it is never too late to mend and (II. 40) avers that even a little of righteousness saves a man from great fear and no effort is lost.

Though the general drift of the Gītā is in favour of Free Will, there are a few passages that seem to savour of determinism, e. g. 'everyone is made to do acts helplessly by the *guṇas* born of Prakṛti (III. 5); 'all beings follow prakṛti (Nature); what can control (or repression) do'? (III. 33); "due to your conceit you think 'I shall not fight,' this thy resolve is vain; (your) Nature will compel you to do it; you being constrained

2552. आयुर्न सुलभं लब्ध्वा नावकर्षेद् विशांपते। उत्कर्षार्थं प्रयतते नरः पुण्येन कर्मणा ॥ शान्तिपर्व 280. 3 (= 291. 3. of cr. ed.).

by your own acts born of your nature will helplessly do that *which you do not wish to do*" (XVIII. 59–60). It may have to be conceded that there is no freedom of will in the matter of environment during childhood.

The Rāmāyaṇa gives expression to the belief that sorrow in the present life is the result of similar actions done in past life or lives. When Rāma left Ayodhyā as an exile for the sake of fulfilling the promise given to queen Kaikeyī by king Daśaratha, Kausalyā, mother of Rāma, laments 'I believe indeed that in a past life I must have made many persons lose their sons or I must have harmed (or killed) living beings; it is therefore that this (sorrow) has befallen me'; 'I think beyond doubt that in a former life, I, a wretched woman, must have cut off the breasts of cows (or mothers) when their calves (or children) desired (to drink milk at the breasts) of their mothers'.[2553]

The Purāṇas also emphasize the importance of good or evil deeds and say that one has to reap the fruits of one's actions, whether good or evil, and Karma does not come to an end even after hundreds of lives unless the results thereof are undergone.[2554] The Padmapurāṇa states 'there is no destruction of Karma except by reaping the fruits thereof; no one can set aside the bondage due to the Karma of past lives' and further 'man by his own actions may become a God, or a human being, cattle, a bird or a lower animal or even a tree (or rock); no man in this world is able to annul the effects of actions done in previous existences by his power or by the birth of progeny'[2555] (son &c). The

2553. मन्ये खलु मया पूर्वं विवत्सा बहवः कृताः। प्राणिनो हिंसिता वापि तस्मादिदमुपस्थितम् ॥ अयोध्याकाण्ड 39. 4; निःसंशयं मया मन्ये पुरा वीर कदर्यया। पातुकामेषु वत्सेषु मातॄणां शातिताः स्तनाः ॥ अयोध्या॰ 43. 17 (Madras Law Journal Press edition).

2554. अवश्यमेव भोक्तव्यं कृतं कर्म शुभाशुभम्। नाभुक्तं क्षीयते कर्म ह्यपि जन्मशतैः प्रिय ॥ नारदीय पु॰ (उत्तरभाग) 29. 18; the quarter नाभुक्तं क्षीयते कर्म is quoted by the भामती on शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. IV. 1. 13. (without name). Vide H. of Dh. Vol. IV. p. 39 note 95 for the same verse quoted by others. भामती notes 'नाभुक्तं...कर्म इति च स्मरणमप्रतिबद्धसामर्थ्यकर्माभिप्रायम्।.'

2555. उपभोगादृते तस्य नाश एव न विद्यते। प्राक्तनं बन्धनं (बन्धकं?) कर्म कोन्यथा कर्तुमर्हति ॥ पद्म. II. 81. 48. and 94. 118; देवत्वमथ मानुष्यं पशूनां पक्षिणां तथा। तिर्यक्त्वं स्थावरत्वं च याति जन्तुः स्वकर्मभिः ॥ पूर्वदेहकृतं कर्म न कश्चित्पुरुषो भुवि। बलेन प्रजया वापि समर्थः कर्तुमन्यथा ॥ पद्म. II. 94. 13, 15. The first occurs in पद्म. II. 81. 43 also. Vide Ṛgveda प्रजाभिरग्ने अमृतत्वमश्याम्' V. 4. 10. and मनु IX. 137 पुत्रेण लोकाञ्जयति पौत्रेणानन्त्यमश्नुते. These are merely laudatory acc. to the पद्म; न तु भोगादृते पुण्यं पापं वा कर्म मानवम्। परित्यजति भोगाच्च पुण्यापुण्ये निबोध मे ॥ मार्कण्डेय 14. 17; यादृशं वपते बीजं क्षेत्रे तु कृषिकारकः। भुनक्ति तादृशं वत्स फलमेव न संशयः ॥ यादृशं क्रियते कर्म तादृशं परिभुज्यते। विनाशहेतुः कर्मास्य सर्वे कर्मवशा वयम् ॥ पद्म. II, 94. 7–8.

idea of transmigration as described in the Upaniṣads had become universal in India at the time of Buddha. Buddha rejected the reality of a permanent ego or self as an entity. He was not a metaphysical philosopher, but wanted to lay down a way or method by which mankind could be freed from ignorance and suffering and liberation could be achieved. Therefore, while rejecting a permanent ego he accepted the doctrine of rebirth.

A side issue has been very much debated by some eminent scholars, viz. whether the cherishers of the Vedānta thoughts were originally the Kṣatriyas and not the Brāhmaṇas. The present author dealt with that question in a brief compass in H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 105-107 and note 222. Deussen in 'Das System des Vedānta' (1883 pp. 18-19) and Ph. Up. (tr. by Geden pp. 18-19) and Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar in 'Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism' p. 9 hold the view that the kṣatriyas were the original possesseors of Vedānta doctrines. Deussen relies mainly on six passages and Dr. Bhandarkar on two only (Chān. V. 3 and 11) and besides Deussen (in Ph. Up. p. 19) admits that his conclusion is not absolute certainty but has a high degree of probability. Barth in 'Religions of India' p. 65, Hopkins in 'Ethics of India' (1924) p. 63, 'Vedic India' by Macdonell and Keith (vol. II. p. 206), and Tuxen on 'The religions of India' (Copenhagen, 1949, p. 88) do not subscribe to this view. Deussen went so far as to aver (p. 19) 'this teaching with regard to the *ātman* was studiously withheld from them (the brāhmaṇas), that it was transmitted in a narrow circle among the kṣatriyas to the exclusion of the brāhmaṇas'. The present author had not set out the passages on which reliance was placed by Deussen and those who followed him. They will be set out here and will be examined as to the context in which they appear and the subject with which they deal. But it must first be emphasized that the most important doctrines of the main and ancient Upaniṣads are two, viz. 'non-difference of the individual self from the Supreme Self, and (2) transmigration of the self depending on his deeds and conduct. Both these doctrines are expounded by Yājñavalkya to king Janaka in various places in the Upaniṣads e. g. in Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 4-7 and following passages. Deussen regards this part of the instruction as deepest, truest and noblest (Ph. Up. p. 348; quoted above on p. 1547) and this passage is (acc. to him) the leading passage on the doctrine of transmigration and on what accompanies the self in its transmigration (Ph. Up. p. 281). Besides, the words of Yājñavalkya

in Bṛ. Up. III. 2. 13 'He who does good is born good' and in IV. 4. 5 'He who does good is born good, he who does evil is born evil, he becomes righteous by righteous works &c.' are declared by Deussen himself (Ph. Up. p. 410) as 'the oldest in which a doctrine of transmigration is found'. Therefore, according to Deussen himself, the original possessor of these two fundamental doctrines of the Upaniṣads is the brāhmaṇa Yājñavalkya who in the same Upaniṣad (Bṛ. Up- II. 4. 1–14) propounds to his wife Maitreyī the identity of the self and elements and everything else with *brahma* (idam sarvam yadayamātmā). Not only so, there are other brāhmaṇa teachers of these. For example, Uddālaka Āruṇi expounds at great length to his son Śvetaketu the doctrine of identity in the famous words 'tat-tvamasi' (Chān. Up. VI. 8-16).

Now the examples on which Deussen (Ph. Up. pp. 17–19) bases his couclusions must be cited and examined. Chān. Up. (V. 11. 1) tells the story of five (named) wealthy householders and great students of Veda who came together and discussed the question 'what is our ātman, what is brahma'. They proposed to go to Uddālaka Āruṇi who knew the self called Vaiśvānara. Uddālaka thought that he would not be able to explain all and therefore told them that Aśvapati Kaikeya (king of Kekaya country) at that time knew the self called Vaiśvānara and all five together with Uddālaka went to that king, who said he would give an answer the next day. The next day those six went to him with fuel in hand (i. e. as pupils) and the king without performing further preparatory rites asked each of them what they medidated upon. When each replied as to what he meditated upon, such as heaven, Āditya, air, ether, water and earth (this last by Uddālaka Āruni), he told them that all these are parts of Vaiśvānara and he explained to them how the proper Agnihotra is to be performed.

Two things should be noticed viz. Uddālaka Āruṇi is here shown as ignorant of true Vaiśvānaravidyā, though in the very next section (Chān. Up. VI. 8. 7. ff.) Uddālaka Āruṇi teaches the sublime doctrine of 'Tat-tvamasi'. Probably these two Uddālakas are different or the present story is more or less a myth. In the second place, all that Aśvapati Kaikeya teaches is about Vaiśvānara and not brahmavidyā (about the identity of individual soul with the Supreme Self. From before the times of Yāska, there have been various opinions about Vaiśvānara, frequently mentioned in the Ṛgveda (e. g. in I. 52. 6. I. 98. 1.). The Nirukta (VII. 21–23) has a long discussion and quotes

three different views viz. that Vaiśvānara is lightning or Āditya or terrestrial fire. The Chān. Up. (V. 18. 2) winds up the description of Vaiśvānara and brings it (V. 19-24) in line with the oblations to five breaths (as 'Prāṇāya' svāhā &c.) and sets forth the results of the observance of Agnihotra with full knowledge of its true purport. The Vedāntasūtra (I. 2. 24-32) deals with what is meant by Vaiśvānara in Chān. V. 11 ff. and the conclusion is that it means *paramātman* (the highest Self) and not individual self or fire as an element or the digestive (stomach) heat.

Deussen then refers to the story of Gārgya Bālāki (in Bṛ. Up. II. 1) who offered to expound *brahma* to Ajātaśatru, king of Kāśī, who offered to give a thousand cows if he did so and remarked that people run exclaiming 'Janaka, Janaka' (meaning Janaka is donor and also listener to *brahma* exposition).[2556] Bālāki offered twelve objects of meditation on brahma such as the person in the sun, the person in the moon &c. Ajātaśatru replied as to the twelve objects that he knew them already and brahma is different from them and cannot be understood by what he said. Then Bālāki remained silent. Bālāki offered to be his pupil. Then Ajātaśatru said[2557] " this is topsy-turvy that a brāhmaṇa should approach a ksatriya as a pupil with the idea 'the kṣatriya would expound *brahman* to him.' I shall make known to you (brahma)." So saying he took hold of Bālāki's hand and got up (from his seat). Certain matters in this story must be carefully noted here. This does not at all say that the class of brāhmaṇas did not know brahmavidyā and that kṣatriyas alone were then the only possessors of it. On the contrary, Janaka is specially mentioned as a donor of cows and is eager to listen to brahmavidyā and people ran to him desiring to accept large gifts of cows for imparting brahmavidyā. We

---

2556. दृप्तबालाकिर्हानूचानो गार्ग्य आस स होवाचाजातशत्रुं काश्यं ब्रह्म ते ब्रवाणीति स होवाचाजातशत्रुः सहस्रमेतस्यां वाचि दद्मो जनको जनक इति वै जना धावन्तीति। बृह. उप. II. 1. 1; the words 'ब्रह्म ते ... धावन्तीति occur in कौषीतकि उप. IV. which has the same story with some variations. Max-Muller's tr. in. S. B. E. vol. I. p. 300 " for verily all people run away saying 'Janaka (king of Mithilā) is our father (patron) " is not accurate and does not bring out the sense properly. Saṅkarācārya's explanation is far more satisfactory' 'जनको दित्सुर्जनकः शुश्रूषुरिति ब्रह्म शुश्रूषवो विवक्षवः प्रतिजिघृक्षवश्च जना धावन्ति).'

2557. सहोवाचाजातशत्रुः। प्रतिलोमं चैतद्यद् ब्राह्मणः क्षत्रियमुपेयाद् ब्रह्म मे वक्ष्यतीति। व्येव त्वा ज्ञपयिष्यामीति। तं पाणावादायोत्तस्थौ। बृह. उप. almost the same words occur in कौषी. उप. IV. 18 'प्रतिलोमरूपमेव तत् स्याद्यत्क्षत्रियो ब्राह्मणमुपनयेत्। एहि व्येव त्वा ज्ञपयिष्यामीति तं ह पाणावभिपद्य प्रवव्राज।'.

know about Janaka from Bṛ. Up. III. 1 ff. wherein Janaka king of Videha, offered a thousand cows and, when Yājñavalkya took away those cows, numerous persons present in Janaka's court such as his hotṛ priest Aśvala, Ārtabhāga, Gargī, Uddālaka Āruṇi, Vidagdha Śākalya ply him with questions. In Bṛ. Up. IV. 4, 7 (Janaka offers a thousand cows to Yājñavalkya, in IV. 4.23 (Janaka offers to give his Videha kingdom to Yājñavalkya along with himself as a slave). The story of Bālāki only comes to this at the most that when Janaka had learnt brahmavidyā, a brāhmaṇa Bālāki did not know it though he professed to know it, and had to be instructed in it by king Ajātaśatru of Kāśī, who knew it and who only stated that a brāhmaṇa did not become a pupil of a kṣatriya. All brāhmṇas could never have been proficient in brahmavidyā much less kṣatriyas. One regrets to say that Deussen is guilty of making a sweeping generalisation without adequate data. It may be noted that in this story Ajātaśatru of Kāśī does not say that the Vidyā was not known to any brāhmaṇas before (as Pravāhaṇa Jaivali claimed), but, on the contrary, expressed surprise that a brāhmaṇa should come to him for learning the Vidyā.

The same story occurs in Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad[2558] IV. 1-19 often in the same words. Bālāki offers 16 explanations about the objects of his meditation. The V. S. devotes three sūtras (I. 4. 16-18) to the passage in which Ajātaśatru stated 'He who is the maker of those persons (you mentioned), he of whom all this is the work, he alone is to be known'. There is in Bṛ. Up. II. 1 and Kauṣītaki Up. IV hardly anything about transmigration. Both passages simply affirm that from the Ātman all prāṇas, all worlds, all gods, all elements spring forth (Bṛ. II. 2. 20). This is nothing more than what is stated in the leading text (Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 7) of Yājñavalkya or in Chān. Up. VI. 1-16 in the oft-repeated words of Āruṇi to his son Śvetaketu (aitadātmyam idam sarvam...tattvamasi).

It is most surprising that Deussen should press into service the story of Sanatkumāra and Nārada in order to fortify his proposition that kṣatriyas were the *original* possessors of the great doctrines of Vedānta. He relies on Chān. Up. VII, where

2558. यो वै बालाक एतेषां पुरुषाणां कर्ता यस्य वैतत्कर्म स वै वेदितव्य इति। कौषी. उप. IV. 18. The conclusion in वे. सू. I. 4. 16-18 *is that the person to be* known is Paramātman and the words यस्य वैतत्कर्म refer to the world (जगत्), *and that this has no reference to 'jīva' or principal prāṇa.*

it is said that Nārada approached Sanatkumāra and prayed 'Teach me, Sir.' Sanatkumāra said to him 'tell me what you know; then I shall tell you what is beyond that'. Nārada stated (in Chān. Up. VII. 1-2) that he had studied the four Vedas, [2559] Itihāsa-purāṇa and gave a long list of lores including Devavidyā, Brahmavidyā (whatever that may mean), ksatravidyā, Nakṣatravidyā, admitted he knew *mantras* only and did not know Ātman (the Self) and added 'I have heard from men like you that he who knows the Ātman overcomes sorrow. I am in sorrow; *bhagavan* ! do help me to cross (to get over) my sorrow.' Sanatkumāra replied 'whatever you have studied is mere name, there is something better than a name'. Then Sanatkumāra teaches him to meditate on speech as better than name, then on *manas* as better than speech and several others as better than the preceding (in VII. 4-24) till he reaches *bhūman* (the Infinite, the Paramātman) and describes *bhūman* in VII. 25-26 ending with the words 'all this springs from the Self' and it is stated at the end (in VII. 26. 2) 'Bhagavān (venerable) Sanatkumāra showed to Nārada, all whose blemishes had been crushed (uprooted), what is beyond darkness (avidyā); they call him (Sanatkumāra) Skanda.' [2560]

In all this long passage there is not a word whether Sanatkumāra and Nārada belonged to a brāhmaṇa or kṣatriya class. Skanda is known in classical Sanskrit as the God of War (as in Gītā X. 24 'Senānīnām-aham Skandaḥ') and in the Vanaparva 229. 22-23 he is mentioned as the commander of the armies of gods and the Śāntiparva mentions that Nārada approached Devala for knowledge about the creation and dissolution of the world (chap. 275 = 267 of Cr. ed.). From this Deussen at once draws the conclusion that Sanatkumāra must have been a kṣatriya and Nārada a brāhmaṇa. In the Mahābhārata, Manusmṛti and the Purāṇas both of them are semi-divine sages and beyond varṇa or caste. Gītā X. 13 speaks of Nārada as Devarṣi, the Vāyu-purāṇa speaks of Parvata and Nārada as sons of Kaśyapa and as included among Devarṣis (Vāyu 61. 85). The Manusmṛti includes Nārada among the first ten Prajāpatis

---

2559. Compare Bṛ. Up. II. 4. 10 for a similar but smaller list of lores that are said to be the breath of the great Being and another list of the four Vedas and six Vedāṅgas (called aparāvidyā) in Muṇḍaka Up. I. 1. 5.

2560. तस्मै मृदितकषायाय तमसस्पारं दर्शयति भगवान् सनत्कुमारः। तं स्कन्द इत्याचक्षते। छा. उप. VII. 26. 2. कषाय means रागद्वेषादिदोष; the root स्कन्द् is given two senses in धातुपाठ viz. गति and शोषणे.

(I. 25). The Brahmapurāṇa (I. 46–47) describes both Skanda and Sanatkumāra as sons of Brahmā. The Nāradīyapurāṇa (Pūrvabhāga, 2. 3) speaks of Sanaka, Sanandana, Sanatkumāra and Sanātana as the mind-born sons of Brahmā and Sanatkumāra as *brahmavādin* and as expounding all Dharmas to Nārada. The Vāmanapurāna (60. 68–69) describes the same four as sons of Dharma and Ahiṁsā, and as exponders of Yogaśāstra. To crown all, Kūrmapurāṇa [2561] I. 7. 20–21 speaks of these four along with Kratu as *Vipras* (brāhmaṇas), yogins, and as mind-born sons of Brahmā. Sanatkumāra might have been literally or metaphorically called 'Skanda', because he attacked and routed *Avidyā* just as God Skanda routed armies of asuras, if at all the myth about Skanda was known in times before the Upaniṣads.

Chān. Up. I. 8 narrates that there were (in some part of India not mentioned) three persons well versed in (the esoteric meaning of Udgītha i. e. Om), viz. Śilaka Śālāvatya, Caikitāyana Dālbhya and Pravāhana Jaivali. They sat down for a discussion on Udgītha. The first two (who were brāhmaṇas) first put questions to each other and answered. Then Pravāhana Jaivali told them that they were giving replies about matters that were not permanent. Then Pravāhana Jaivali told them that Ākāśa was the origin of this world, that beings owe their origin to Ākāśa and will return into it, that Ākāśa is Udgītha, greater than the great and without end &c. Deussen relies on this passage also for supporting his theory. Udgīthavidyā is only one of several *Upāsanās* in the Upanisads. Therefore, what would follow is that Pravāhaṇa Jaivali knew it and two brāhmanas of some place not mentioned did not know it. It is not possible to see how this story lends any support to Deussen's sweeping thesis of all brāhmaṇas being originally excluded from the central doctrine of identity. In the same context (Chān. Up. I. 9. 3) Pravāhaṇa mentions that one Atidhanvan Śaunaka[2562] taught Udgītha-vidyā to Udaraśāṇḍilya.

2561. अग्रे ससर्ज वै ब्रह्मा मानसानात्मनः समान्। सनकं सनातनं चैव तथैव च सनन्दनम्। क्रतुं सनत्कुमारं च पूर्वमेव प्रजापतिः। पञ्चैते योगिनो विप्राः परं वैराग्यमाश्रिताः। कूर्म I. 7. 19–21.

2562. *Dhanus* becomes 'dhanvan' when it is at the end of a bahuvrīhi compound, according to Pāṇini V. 4. 132. (धनुषश्च). What is the meaning of अतिधन्वन् as a बहुव्रीहि? It may mean 'who has gone beyond the bow (i. e. who is far above those who wield the bow). धन्वन् itself means a bow (as in Ṛg. VI. 75. 2 and 3) and 'arid desert' in the Ṛgveda (x. 4. 1. धन्वन्निव प्रपा असि). Then अतिधन्वन् may mean one who had crossed an arid desert and would have nothing to do with one wielding a bow.

Deussen without giving any reason asserts 'the names allow of the conjecture that in this case also a brāhmaṇa received instruction from a kṣatriya' (p. 18). He probably connected the first name with 'dhanus' (bow) which was the *forte* of kṣatriyas. But he forgets that Śaunaka and Śāṇḍilya are both brāhmaṇa names. This will illustrate how even the most profound scholar goes astray when he becomes over-enthusiastic about a theory of his. In this story Pravāhaṇa does not claim that the Udgīthavidyā was unknown among brāhmaṇas. On the contrary he himself states that Śaunaka, a brāhmaṇa (called Atidhanvan) expounded that Vidyā to Udaraśāṇḍilya, another brāhmaṇa. Besides, Udgīthavidya is only one among numerous upāsanās and what Pravāhaṇa teaches is that all *bhūtas* spring from Ākāśa and are absorbed in Ākāśa, the purport being that Ākāśa here denotes *brahman* as the V. S. (I. 1. 22) establishes. This doctrine is the same as the one taught in Tai. Up. III. 6 (basis of V. S. I. 1.2) and other texts. Moreover, there is nothing about transmigration in this passage of Chān. Up.

The sheet anchor of the views of Deussen and Dr. Bhandarkar are the dialogue between Pravāhaṇa Jaivali and Śvetaketu (Bṛ. Up. VI. 2, Chān. Up. V. 3–10) about Pañcāgnividyā and that between Aśvapati Kaikeya and Uddālaka Āruṇi about Vaiśvānara (Chān. V. 11. 24). The latter has been already dealt with. In the former occurs an important passage which has been made much of and misunderstood. Before proceeding to expound the Pañcāgnividyā to Śvetaketu and his father Āruṇi Gautama, Pravāhaṇa Jaivali remarks (Chān. Up. V. 3. 7) 'this vidyā did not go to brāhmaṇas before you; therefore in all worlds domination (or government) has remained with the kṣatriya class alone'. In the corresponding Bṛ. Up. passage the words are 'this vidyā did not reside in any brāhmaṇa before this day, but I shall expound it to you, for, who would like to refuse when you address me thus'[2563] (viz. I approach you as pupil). In the

2563. यथेयं न प्राक् त्वत्तः पुरा विद्या ब्राह्मणान् गच्छति। तस्मादु सर्वेषु लोकेषु क्षत्रस्यैव प्रशासनमभूत्। छा. V. 3. 7; यथेयं विद्येतः पूर्वं न कस्मिंश्चन ब्राह्मण उवास। तां त्वहं तुभ्यं वक्ष्यामि। को हि त्वैवं ब्रुवन्तमर्हति प्रत्याख्यातुमिति। बृह. VI. 2. 8. प्रशासन is translated by MaxMuller as 'teaching' in S. B. E. Vol. I. p. 78. But it is better to take प्रशासन in the sense of 'domination or government,' as is clearly the meaning of the word in Bṛ. Up. III. 8. 9 एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठतः'. Besides, there is nothing to show that kṣatriya rulers everywhere were teaching that doctrine (if we take praśāsane to mean

(*Continued on next page*)

Kauṣītaki Up. I. the doctrine of the two paths of Devayāna and Pitṛyāṇa is expounded to Āruni (and his son Śvetaketu) by Citra Gārgyāyaṇi (v. l. Gāṅgyāyani), but the remarks about kṣatriyas alone being the first possessors of the doctrine do not occur there at all and Gārgyāyaṇi appears to be a brāhmaṇa teacher. The question is: what is meant by 'this vidyā' in the above passages of Chān. and Bṛ. Upaniṣads? In the Upaniṣads (particularly in Chāndogya and Bṛ.) numerous vidyās for the *upāsanā* of *brahman* by men that are not yet far advanced on the path of *brahmavidyā* are dilated upon, such as Udgīthavidyā (Chān. Up. I. 8-9, Bṛ. Up. I. 3), Daharavidyā (Chān. VIII. 1. 1-2, Bṛ. Up. I. 3, Vedāntasūtra I. 3. 14-21), Madhuvidyā (Chān. III. 1. 1 ff., Bṛ. Up. II. 5. 1-15), Saṁvargavidyā (Chān. IV. 3). In the same way Pañcāgnividyā is an Upāsanā. Deussen and others admit (as shown above) that the great and original texts about the identity of the individual self with the Supreme Self and about transmigration of the soul based on works and conduct are those of Yājñavalkya in the Bṛ. Up. The Pañcāgnividyā expatiates upon and is concerned mainly with only one aspect of transmigration viz. the path of those who living in a village practise a life of sacrifices, works of public utility and alms. The five fires and five offerings relate only to the pitṛyāṇa path. It contains an esoteric and semi-physical explanation of the process by which persons come to be born again on the earth. At the most it may be argued that some kṣatriya rulers or noblemen claimed to have given an esoteric or metaphorical explanation of the mode of the return of pious men from the moon to the earth again. Nothing positive is said as to whether Pravāhaṇa Jaivali was the ruler of a country or only a kṣatriya (rājanya in Bṛ. Up. VI. 2.3, Chān. Up. V. 3.5) but we are told that Aśvapati was king of the Kekaya country in the extreme northwest of India, while the original proclaimer of the immortality of the self and its identity with the supreme self was Yājñavalkya who was in Videha (Mithilā, modern Bihar), which was at least a thousand miles away from Kekaya. Yājñavalkya's philosophy must have taken a long time before it became well known in the distant Kekaya. Conceding for argument that a few rulers like Aśvapati were the first to propound an explanation of the

---

(*Continued from last page*)

(teaching). Further, this sentence (in Chān. V. 3. 7. is a boastful assertion like the one of Aśvapati in Chān. V. 11. 5. that there was in his country of Kekaya no thief, no miser, no drunkard, no man who had not consecrated sacred fire in his house, no ignorant person and no adulterer.

way of the transmigration of pious sacrificers and the like, it is a far cry from that to assume as Deussen does (Ph. Up. p. 20) that the doctrine of the Ātman as the first Principle of the universe was fostered and progressively developed by the kṣatriyas in opposition to the principles of the brahmanical ritual and this assumption is contrary to what he himself states elsewhere in his own work (pp. 410, 281, 348).

Before proceeding further a passage from the Bṛ. Up. I. 4. 10 and another from the Ait. Up. (II. 4–5) would have to be considered. In Bṛ. Up. occurs the following passage:[2564] "In the beginning *brahman* was there, it cognised itself as 'I am brahma'; therefore it became all; whoever from among the Gods perceived this (viz. 'I am brahman'), he became that (brahman); the same occurred to sages and men. The sage Vāmadeva realizing this reached the conclusion 'I was (or became) Manu and the Sun also.' Therefore, this (will occur) even now. Whoever (even a man) who realizes 'I am brahman he becomes (identical with) all this (universe); even the gods are not able to prevent that man's being one with brahman and with all, for he is the soul of all these." Deussen translates 'aham Manurabhavam Sūryaśca' as 'I was once Manu, I was once the Sun'. There is no word for 'once' and it is supplied by Deussen who remarks 'as a proof of his knowledge of *brahman*, (Vāmadeva) alleged his acquaintance with his former births as Manu and Sūrya' (p. 317). The words can very well be construed as meaning that Vāmadeva, having realized

---

2564. ब्रह्म वा इदमग्र आसीत्। तदात्मानमेवावेत्। अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति। तस्मात्तत्सर्वमभवत्। तद्यो यो देवानां प्रत्यबुध्यत स एव तदभवत्। तथर्षीणाम्। तथा मनुष्याणाम्। तद्धैतत्पश्यन्नृषिर्वामदेवः प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चेति। तदिदमप्येतर्हि य एवं वेदाहं ब्रह्मास्मीति स इदं सर्वं भवति। तस्य ह न देवाश्चनाभूत्या ईशते। आत्मा ह्येषां स भवति। बृह. उप. I. 4. 10; compare मुण्डकोप. III. 2. 9 'यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति। ... तरति शोकं तरति पाप्मानं गुहाग्रन्थिभ्यो विमुक्तोऽमृतो भवति।'; कठोप. 4. 15 यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेव भवति। एवं मुनेर्विजानत आत्मा भवति गौतम।; कठोप. 6. 14 'अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते॥; मुण्डक III. 2. 8 यथा नद्यः ... परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम् and प्रश्न. VI. 5 स यथेमा नद्यः &c.; छा. उप. VIII. 12. 3 and वे. सू. I. 4. 22 and शाङ्करभाष्य thereon. These passages emphasize that the moment a man realizes the identity of the self and the Supreme Self and moulds his life accordingly, he becomes *brahman* and that his works after this realization do not cling to him. Vide for this latter proposition, Chān. Up. IV. 14. 3 (यथा पुष्करपलाश आपो न श्लिष्यन्त एवमेवंविदि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यत इति), Muṇḍaka Up. III. 1. 3 (तदा विद्वान्पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति). मुण्डक II. 2. 9, बृह. उप. IV. 4. 22–23 and वे. सू. IV. I. 13–15.

brahman when he sang the hymn Ṛg. IV. 26, expressed his identity with Manu and Sūrya (and the whole universe). There is no express reference to former births and Śaṅkarācārya in [2565] his bhāṣya on Bṛ. Up. understands the passage in this sense and does not refer to former births. It cannot be said that the Bṛ. Up. quotes Ṛg. IV. 26. 1 for supporting the conception of transmigration but it relies on it merely for the conception of identity of the individual soul with the Supreme Self.

Then there is a passage in the Ait. Up. which Deussen refers to (pp. 317–318 of Ph. Up.). In the 2nd adhyāya that Upaniṣad refers to the conception of a person as the first birth; when the child is actually born that is described as the 2nd birth. Then it proceeds "He (the son) being the self of the father is placed in his (the father's) stead for the performance of all sacred works; then his other self (the father) having performed all he has to do and having reached the span of his life (having become very old) departs (from this world) and departing from this world is born again, that is his third birth. And this has been declared by a sage 'while dwelling in (mother's) womb I came to know all the births of the gods; a hundred strongholds of *ayas* (copper or iron) held me, but I escaped down with speed like a hawk.' Vāmadeva lying in his mother's womb declared this". In this passage the father and son are treated as identical, as elsewhere it is so said (vide note below). This Ṛgveda verse (the 2nd half) is liable to several interpretations. In the Ṛgveda (I. 80. 2, VIII. 95. 3, IX. 68. 6, X. 11. 4 &c.) it is frequently stated that (śyena) hawk brings Soma for Indra. Śyena may also be interpreted as standing for the soul and the iron fortresses as the bodies through which the transmigrating soul wanders. The Ṛgveda sage might have only meant the mythical hawk of Indra. But as the word 'janimāni' occurs in the first half the Upaniṣadic sage (in Ait. Up.) might have used the verse to support his ideas about the three births. But even in the Ait. Up. passage the three births are not clearly of one person, unless we resort to a myth, viz. the conception of a son and the son's birth are

---

2565. स एतस्मिन् ब्रह्मात्मदर्शनेऽवस्थितः एतान्मन्त्रान्ददर्श अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चेत्यादीन्। तदेतद् ब्रह्म पश्यन्निति ब्रह्मविद्या परामृश्यते। अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चेत्यादिना सर्वभावापत्तिं ब्रह्मविद्याफलं परामृशति। पश्यन् सर्वात्मभावं फलं प्रतिपेदे इत्यस्मात्प्रयोगात् ब्रह्मविद्यासहायसाधनसाध्यं मोक्षं दर्शयति। ... तस्य ह ब्रह्मविज्ञातुर्यथोक्तेन विधिना देवा महावीर्याश्च नापि अभूत्यै अभवनाय ब्रह्मसर्वभावस्य नेशते न पर्याप्ताः किमुतान्ये। शाङ्करभाष्य on बृह. उप. I. 4. 10. अहं मनुरभवं is Ṛg. IV. 26. 1.

taken as the two births of the father himself on the ground that the son is the father himself born again.[2566]

The Upaniṣads laid down an inexorable law that fruits of all actions, good or evil, must be experienced and that a person's deeds and conduct determined the character of his succeeding existences. But from some passages in the Upaniṣads themselves it appears that they recognised some exceptions. One exception was that when a pesron realized that he was one with *brahman* the actions both good and evil, if any, done by him after that Realization and before the physical death of the body produced no results. In Chān. Up. VI. 14. 3 Satyakāma[2567] Jābāla tells his pupil Upakosala that 'Just as water does not cling to a lotus leaf, so no evil deed clings to one who knows (realizes) *brahman*'; Chan. Up. V. 24. 3 'just as the (soft) cottonlike fibres of the *iṣīkā* reed when cast into fire are burnt out, so all evil deeds of him who knowing (the purport of) Vaiśvānara (brahma) offers Agnihotra are burnt'. The Bṛ. Up. states 'Him who knows these two do not overwhelm, whether he says that he did evil for some reason or that he did a good deed for some reason; he overcomes both these; neither what he has done nor what he has omitted to do afflict (lit. heat or burn) him'. The Muṇḍaka Up. provides 'when a person has seen (realized) the Highest (cause) and lowest (effect) his actions perish.' But this is only true as regards all acts before he attained Realization and all acts that his body may do after his attainment of Realization but he cannot rescind the *prārabdha karma* which brought about that existence wherein he reached Realization of *brahman*. The idea is that the actions which led to a person's present embodiment must all be consumed by the body persisting till the appointed period for its death, and then only he becomes free from the

---

2566. सोऽस्यायमात्मा पुण्येभ्यः कर्मभ्यः प्रतिधीयते। अथास्यायमितर आत्मा कृतकृत्यो वयोगतः प्रैति। स इतः प्रयन्नेव पुनर्जायते। तदस्य तृतीयं जन्म। तदुक्तमृषिणा। गर्भे नु ... निरदीयम्॥ इति। गर्भ एवैतच्छयानो वामदेव एवमुवाच। ऐ. उप. II. 5. This has been quoted on p. 1541. अथ प्रोष्यायन् पुत्रस्य मूर्धानमभिमृशेत्। अङ्गादङ्गात् सम्भवसि हृदयादधिजायसे। आत्मा त्वं पुत्र माविथ स जीव शरदः शतम्। कौषी उप. II. 11. This is quoted as a ṛk in Nirukta III. 4 (probably because it occurs in the Kauṣītaki Āraṇyaka of the Ṛgveda).

2567. यथा पुष्करपलाश आपो न श्लिष्यन्त इति। छा. उप. IV. 14. 3; तद्यथेषीकातूलमग्नौ प्रोतं प्रदूयेतैवं हास्य सर्वे पाप्मानः प्रदूयन्ते य एतदेवं विद्वानग्निहोत्रं जुहोति। छा. उप. V. 24. 3; एतमु हैवैते न तरत इति। अतः पापमकरवमिति। अतः कल्याणमकरवमिति। उभे उ हैवैष एते तरति। नैनं कृताकृते तपतः। बृह. उप. IV. 4. 22; क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे। मुण्डक II. 2. 8; एवमेवेहाचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद। तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्य इति। छा. उप. VI. 14. 2.

physical body. The Chān. Up. states[2568] as to a man who has attained true knowledge of the Supreme Self from a teacher that 'for him there is only delay so long as he is not delivered (from the body), then he will become perfect'. All these Upaniṣad passages are relied upon in V. S. IV. 1. 13–15 and Śaṅkarācārya explains their purpose concisely but very clearly. The Gītā also says (IV. 37) that the fire of knowledge reduces to ashes all deeds. Here all means only *Sañcita* and *Sañciyamāna* and excludes *prārabdha-karma*. About the acts during the period between the attainment of *Vidyā* and the fall of the body Śaṅkarācārya gives the instance of an arrow shot from a bow, which stops only after the initial impetus is exhausted in the flight of the arrow. Some works say that when the meritorious deed or the sinful deed done in the present life is of the extremest kind it may yield results in this very life.[2569]

The Upaniṣad theory is that one must bear the consequences of all actions, good or evil. But sometimes an evil action is done without any previous thought, as, for example, when a man's gun goes off by accident and somebody is killed or seriously injured. This led to a discussion in Dharmasūtras and Smṛtis and the doctrine of prāyaścittas (expiations) for sins was developed. From Vedic times some rites had been performed to counteract mishaps and irregularities in the course of religious ceremonies and for portentous phenomena or personal misfortunes such as a dog-bite. In these the idea was

---

2568. तदधिगम उत्तरपूर्वाघयोरश्लेषविनाशौ तद्व्यपदेशात् । इतरस्याप्येवमसंश्लेषः पाते तु । अनारब्धकार्ये एव तु पूर्वे तदवधेः । वेदान्तसूत्र IV. 1. 13–15; शाङ्करभाष्य 'ब्रह्माधिगमे सत्युत्तरपूर्वयोरघयोरश्लेषविनाशौ भवतः उत्तरस्याश्लेषः, पूर्वस्य विनाशः इतरस्यापि पुण्यस्य कर्मणः एवमघवदसंश्लेषो विनाशश्च ज्ञानवतो भवतः। अवश्यंभाविनी विदुषः शरीरपाते मुक्तिरित्यवधार्यते ।'. On बृह. उप. 1. 4. 10 the शाङ्करभाष्य states 'यावच्छरीरपातस्तावत्फलोपभोगाङ्गतया विपरीतप्रत्ययं रागादिदोषं च तावन्मात्रमाक्षिपत्येव । मुक्तेषुवत्प्रवृत्तफलत्वात्तद्धेतुकस्य कर्मणः । तेन न तस्य निवर्तिकी विद्या । अविरोधात् । ... ज्ञानोत्पत्तेः प्रागूर्ध्वं तत्काल-जन्मान्तरसञ्चितानां च कर्मणामप्रवृत्तफलानां विनाशः सिद्धो भवति ।.' The विज्ञानदीपिका of पद्मपाद says 'उभयोर्ज्ञानतो नाशो भोगात्प्रारब्धकर्मणः ।' (verse 9). The com. says: ज्ञान is of two kinds, परोक्ष and अपरोक्ष. The first is in the form 'there is brahman and I must engage in *upāsanā* thereof.' The other is of this sort: 'ब्रह्म सत्यं जगन्मिथ्या। अतोहमपि ब्रह्मैवेत्याकारकं यज्ज्ञानं तदपरोक्षम्। अपरोक्षज्ञानं तावत्प्रारब्धेतरकर्मनाशकम् । एवं चात्र ज्ञानमपरोक्षमेव। तस्मादुभयोः सञ्चितसञ्चीयमानयोः कर्मणोर्नाशो बीजलोपः ।'

2569. पूर्वं फलति देहेऽस्मिन् कृतमत्र परत्र यत् । अदृष्टत्वाद् द्वयोरेवोत्कटमत्रैव जन्मनि ॥ वि. दी. 10; com. says 'उत्कटं तु कर्म शुभमशुभमपि एतज्जन्मकृतमेतस्मिन्नेव जन्मनि प्रारब्धमाक्रम्य फलति'. Compare अत्युत्कटैः पापपुण्यैरिहैव फलमश्नुते ।.

of ceremonial purity and the averting of evil results from such phenomena in which no question of sin as ordinarily understood entered. In the Gautama Dharmasūtra there is a discussion on this, which is probably the earliest clear exposition on expiations for sins. Gautama states that there were two views on the efficacy of expiations against sins. One view was that expiations should not be performed as regards sins, because a sin is not destroyed unless its consequences are experienced; the other view was that one should perform expiations since there are Vedic passages indicative of this, such as 'after performing the sacrifice called Punaḥstoma one can come back (i. e. become fit for) Soma sacrifice (i. e. for all Vedic rites in general)'; 'after performing the Vrātyastoma' (one becomes fit for vedic sacrifices), 'he who offers the Aśvamedha sacrifice crosses beyond all sin, beyond (even)[2570] brāhmaṇa murder.' Some held the view that only sins committed inadvertently were removed by expiations;[2571] while others held the view that expiations were efficacious even against sins committed wilfully as there are Vedic indications to that effect (Manu XI. 45). Manu, however, appears to have held that a man is relieved of the lapses inadvertently committed by means of the study of the Veda, but sins wilfully committed can be removed only by various prescribed expiations (XI. 46) and that a man must always resort to expiations for sins, since those who have not done so have to undergo a double retribution viz. the tortures of horrible hells for long terms of years and also being born in other human existences with bodily deformities and diseases (Manu XI. 48 and XII. 54). The subject of expiations and of Karmavipāka (fruition of evil actions by being born as a worm or lower animal, or having a short life and premature death and undergoing torments of Hell) has been dealt with at length in H. of Dh. Vol. IV. pp. 1–178).

2570. तत्र प्रायश्चित्तं कुर्यात्र कुर्यादिति मीमांसन्ते। न कुर्यादित्याहुः। न हि कर्म क्षीयत इति। कुर्यादित्यपरम्। पुनः स्तोमेनेष्ट्वा पुनः सवनमायान्तीति विज्ञायते। व्रात्यस्तोमैश्चेष्ट्वा। तरति सर्वं पाप्मानं तरति ब्रह्महत्यां योऽश्वमेधेन यजते। अग्निष्टुताऽभिशस्यमानं याजयेदिति च। गौ. ध. सू. 19. 3–10. Vide वसिष्ठधर्मसूत्र 22. 3–7 for almost the same words. For explanation of all these, vide H. of Dh. vol. IV pp. 61–62 and notes 152-153 thereon. For Aśvamedha freeing the sacrificer from all sins, from even brāhmaṇa-murder, vide Tai. S. V. 3. 12. 2 and Śat. Br. XIII. 3. 1. 1 'सर्वं वा एतेन पाप्मानं देवा अतरन्नपि वा एतेन ब्रह्महत्यामतरंस्तरति सर्वं पाप्मानं तरति ब्रह्महत्यां योऽश्वमेधेन यजते।.'

2571. अनभिसन्धिकृते प्रायश्चित्तमपराधे। अभिसन्धिकृतेऽप्येके। वसिष्ठ 20. 1–2..

So far as rebirth for sins is concerned attention may be drawn here to the following authorities : Manusmṛti XII. 54–69, Yāj. III. 131, 135–136, 207–215, Viṣṇudharmasūtra, chap. 44, Atrismṛti 4. 5–14, 17–44, Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa 15. 1–41 (B. I. ed.), Brahmapurāṇa 217. 37–110, Garuḍapurāṇa, Pretakāṇḍa, chap 2. 60–88 (which incorporate almost word for word Yāj. III. 206–215) and also quotations from Śaṅkha Dharmasūtra collected by the present author in ABORI. vol. VIII, pp. 116–117 items 375–378 culled from the Mitākṣarā on Yāj. III. 216, the Madanapārijāta pp. 701–702, the Parāśara-Mādhavīya, vol. II. part 2 pp. 246, 259, 263, 269. For reasons of space it is not possible to set out this whole mass but a few illustrative passages will be cited.

Manu states (XII. 54–69, with which Yāj. III. 206–208 and 212–215 agree in many places) 'those guilty of mortal sins (Mahāpātakas), having gone through terrible hells during a large numbers of years, come after the expiration (of hell punishment) to the following births. The slayer of a Brāhmaṇa passes through the births of dog, pig, ass, camel, cow (or ox), goat, sheep, deer, a bird, a cāṇḍāla and a pukkasa; a brāhmaṇa who drinks the liquor called Surā enters the bodies of worms and (large) insects, of moths (or locusts), of birds feeding on ordure and of carnivorous animals; a brāhmaṇa (who steals gold of a brāhmaṇa) shall pass a thousand times through the births of spiders, snakes, lizards, aquatic animals and of destructive goblins; the violator of his guru's bed passes a hundred times through (the form of) grasses, shrubs, creepers, carnivorous animals and of beasts with fangs and of those (animals) like tigers doing cruel acts. Those men who are given to injuring others become animals that eat raw flesh, those who eat forbidden food become worms, those that thieve become creatures consuming their own kind (such as fishes) and those who have intercourse with women of the lowest classes become *pretas* (ghostly spirits); one who has associated with outcasts (for certain specified periods), he who approaches the wives of other men and he who has deprived a brāhmaṇa of his property (other than gold) becomes Brahmarākṣasa (an evil demon); a man who has on account of greed stolen gems, pearls or coral or any of the other kinds of precious stones is born among goldsmiths; for stealing grain a brāhmaṇa becomes a rat, for stealing bell-metal a man becomes a haṁsa bird, for depriving another of water he becomes the bird called Plava, for stealing honey a stinging

insect, for stealing milk a cow, for stealing sweet juice (sugar—cane &c) a dog, for stealing clarified butter an ichneumon; for stealing meat a vulture, for stealing fat a cormorant, for stealing oil a bird called Tailapaka, for stealing salt a cricket, for stealing curds a bird called Balākā (crane); for stealing silk a partridge, for stealing linen a frog; for stealing cloth of cotton threads Krauñca bird, for stealing a cow an iguana, for stealing molasses a bird called *vāgguda* (a bat?), for stealing fine perfume a musk-rat, for stealing vegetables consisting of leaves a peacock, for stealing cooked food of various kinds a porcupine and for stealing uncooked food a hedgehog; for stealing fire a person becomes a heron, for stealing household utensils a mason-wasp, for stealing dyed garments a *cakora* bird; for stealing a deer or an elephant a wolf, for stealing a horse a tiger, for stealing fruits and roots a monkey, for stealing a woman a bear, for stealing drinking water a *cātaka*, for stealing vehicles a camel, for stealing cattle a he-goat; that man who has forcibly taken away any kind of property belonging to another or who eats sacrificial food of which no part has been offered in sacrifice certainly becomes a lower animal; women also who in like manner committed theft shall incur guilt; they become the females of those same creatures (enumerated above).

It may be noted that some of the births assigned to those guilty of thefts of various articles have some logic or reason behind those regulations e. g. when Manu XII. 62 and Yāj. III. 214 prescribe that a thief of grains becomes a rat in the next birth or when Manu XII. 61 prescribes that a thief of jewels, pearls and coral is born among the class of goldsmiths, one can easily appreciate this retribution as appropriate or reasonable, but the same cannot be said of all others. It is noteworthy that, in spite of what the bhāṣya on Y. S. quoted in note 2325 and pp. 1417-18 above says, a single mortal sin like brāhmaṇa-murder might make the perpetrator pass through several vile births, as stated by Manu in XII. 55-58, Yāj. III. 207-208 and by Śaṅkarācārya.[2572]

Once the strict rule of the original doctrine of Karma in the Upaniṣads was loosened by the theory of prāyaścittas, a

---

2572. ब्रह्महत्यादीनां चैकैकस्य कर्मणोऽनेकजन्मनिमित्तत्वं स्मर्यमाणमुपरुध्येत। न च धर्माधर्मयोः स्वरूपफलसाधनादिसमधिगमे शास्त्रादतिरिक्तं कारणं शक्यं सम्भावयितुम्। शाङ्करभाष्य on वे. सू. III. 1. 8.

quick pace was set even in early times for the removal or reduction of the effects of sins in other ways than by means of expiations. Gautama[2573] prescribes five means for redeeming (or expiating) blamable acts viz. inaudible recitation of the Veda, austerities, sacrifice in fire, fasting, giving gifts. The history of Dharmaśāstra vol. IV deals at some length with *japa* (pp. 44-51), tapas (pp. 42-43), homa (pp. 43-44), dāna (pp. 51-52) and fasting (pp. 52-54). Therefore, it is not necessary to say here anything about them. But attention must be drawn to some special and far-reaching modifications of these and other means. Śūdras and members of *pratiloma* castes were not authorized to study the Veda. Hence the authors of medieval works, particularly of Purāṇas, went so far as to say that remembrance[2574] of the name of Kṛṣṇa is superior to all expiations and all forms of austerities and that if a man only remembers Nārāyaṇa in the morning, noon, evening, at night and other times, he at once secures the destruction of (the consequences of) sins. Other means were also provided for the removal of sins, one being pilgrimage to holy places. Vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 55-56 and 552-580. Another was the practice of prāṇāyāma which has been dealt with on p. 42 of H. Dh. vol. IV.

Even in the earliest times open confession of sin was in certain cases regarded as freeing the person from sin. In the Cāturmāsya called Varuṇa-praghāsa, the wife who took part with her husband had to confess expressly or by some indirect ways whether she had at some time a paramour and if she did so she was purified and could take part in the sacred rites thereafter. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 575-576 and 1098 for this. Similarly, according to Āp. Dh. S. I. 9. 24. 15, I. 10. 28. 19 and 1, 10. 29. 1 it was necessary when undergoing expiations for forsaking one's wife or for brāhmaṇa murder to confess one's sin. So also the brahmacārin, if guilty of sexual intercourse,

---

2573. तस्य निष्क्रयणानि जपस्तपो होम उपवासो दानम्। गौ. ध. सू. 19.11. In 19.12 Gautama gives a long list of Vedic texts the recitation of which purified a person of sins. Manu (XI. 249-250) specifies Vedic hymns and verses that remove the consequence of brāhmaṇa-murder, drinking Surā, theft of gold, violation of guru's bed and other grave and light sins and highly praises (XI. 259-260) the japa of Aghamarṣaṇa hymn (Ṛg. X. 190.1-3) as removing all sins.

2574. प्रायश्चित्तान्यशेषाणि तपःकर्मात्मकानि वै। यानि तेषामशेषाणां कृष्णानुस्मरणं परम्॥ प्रातर्निशि तथा सन्ध्यामध्याह्नादिषु संस्मरन्। नारायणमवाप्नोति सद्यः पापक्षयं नरः॥ विष्णुपु. II. 6. 39 and 41, ब्रह्मपु. 22.39. These are q. by प्राय. विवेक p. 31, अपरार्क p. 1232 and प्राय. तत्त्व p. 524.

had to proclaim his lapse while begging at seven houses (vide Gautama and Manu quoted below).[2575]

Repentance (*anutāpa*). Manu (XII. 227 and 230) provides that a sinner is relieved of the consequences of sin by proclaiming his sin to people, by repentance, by austerities, by recitation of Vedic texts, by gifts in case of distress (i. e. if he is unable to undergo *tapas*); a man after commiting a sin becomes free from it by feeling remorse and if he makes a resolve 'I shall never again do so' he is purified. The Viṣṇupurāṇa provides that, when afer committing a sin the man feels remorse, the one high expiation that he has then to undergo is the remembrance of Hari.[2576] MacNicol, a Scottish Missionary, wrote a work (in 1915) on 'Indian theism' in which he boldly asserts, after referring to the Upanisadic doctrine of Karma that 'there is no place for repentance in the Hindu doctrine of Karma' (p. 223). It has been shown above that confession was known in Vedic times and that repentance was valued in Dharmaśāstra works either as removing sins or as making the repentant man fit for receiving expiatory rites (vide H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 41–42). The worthy missionary author probably thinks his Christian brand of remission of sins by confession and repentance better than the Upaniṣadic teaching. Ancient Indian authors were not prepared to accept mere confession and repentance as enough to absolve a man of all sins. The Biblical position that if one believes in Christ and his gospel, confesses his sins and says he repents (as required in Matthew 4. 17, Mark I. 15 and Luke 24. 47) is very likely to engender among common men a complacent attitude about sins. This complacent frame of mind, the ancient Dharmaśāstra writers wanted to prevent and therefore, they insisted upon a good deal more than repentance and confession of sins. They blended the old doctrine of confession and repentance with retribution viz. hell tortures and vile births. Later Paurāṇik writers approached very close to the probable attitude of common Christians that one has simply to believe in Christ as a redeemer, to confess and to take the name of God for being absolved from all sins. Macnicol either did not

2575. तस्याजिनमूर्ध्ववालं परिधाय लोहितपात्रः सप्त गृहान्भैक्षं चरेत्कर्माचक्षाणः। गौ. 23. 18; मनु XI. 122 एतस्मिन्नेनसि प्राप्ते वसित्वा गर्दभाजिनम्। सप्तागारांश्चरेद्भैक्षं स्वकर्म परिकीर्तयन्॥.

2576. कृते पापेऽनुतापो वै यस्य पुंसः प्रजायते। प्रायश्चित्तं तु तस्यैकं हरिसंस्मरणं परम्॥ विष्णुपु. II. 6. 40.

read the relevant texts from Purāṇas or he forgot them when he made the assertion noted above.

Long before MacNicol wrote and since his days numerous Western scholars brought up in Christian surroundings have expressed their view that the ancient Indian doctrine as regards man's destiny after death is far more preferable to Biblical ideas on the same subject. It is enough to refer to only two or three authors. Arberry in his 'Asiatic Jones' quotes (p. 37) from Sir William Jones' letter to Earl Spencer the following passage 'I am no Hindu, but I hold the doctrine of the Hindus concerning a future state to be incomparably more rational, more pious and more likely to deter men from vice, than the horrid opinions inculcated by Christians on punishments without end'. Lowes Dickinson in 'Religion and Immortality' (Dent and Sons, 1911) observes (on p. 74) 'it is really a consoling idea that our present capacities are determined by our previous actions and that our present actions again will determine our future character'. Owen Rutter, author of 'the scales of Karma' (London, 1925) says that Christianity has failed to solve the intellectual and moral problems which beset those who live in the complexities of the modern world, that he began to study the doctrine of Karma and reincarnation seven years before he wrote the book, which is a personal statement rather than an essay on Karma (pp. 12-13). Many who have written against this doctrine, while conceding that the Upaniṣadic doctrine is an ancient and serious attempt to solve the problem of injustice and evil in the world, call it a weak one and beset with difficulties. One should like to ask, what systems of religion and philosophy are not beset with difficulties? One may take the Christian doctrines for example. To all non-Christians (and to several Christians also in modern times) its doctrine of original sin, its damnation of unbaptized infants, of predestination deduced from the belief that God is an Omniscient and Omnipotent Creator of heaven and earth appear strange and unjustified. L. T. Hobhouse in 'Morals in Evolution' part II (1906) pp. 130 ff points out how all systems with a personal God, particularly Christianity, are beset with difficulties, such as making the problem of evil urgent, eternal punishment for a great sinner in one life suggestive of a moral impossibility, the inescapable conclusion that all men, however good, that did not or could not or do not believe in Christ and are not members of the Christian Church by baptism are irrevocably doomed. That

Christianity is unique and that Christians are God's chosen people are beliefs which would make God appear quite unjust and therefore some Christian writers like Prof. Toynbee in 'Christianity among the religions of the world' (Oxford Un. Press, 1958) have begun to urge that Christianity must be purged of such beliefs (pp. 13 and 95).

The strict doctrine of Karma would require that there can be no transfer of good or bad *karma* from one man to another and a man cannot suffer for the sins of others. But in the Ṛgveda there are allusions to the belief that God might inflict punishment on the sons for the sins of their fathers. For example, in Ṛg. VII. 86. 5 Vasiṣṭha[2577] prays to Varuṇa "cast away from us the transgressions of our fathers, and those that we committed in our own person'; 'May we not have to suffer for the sin committed by another, may we not do that for which you punish (this is addressed to Viśve-devāḥ). The Śāntiparva, however, asserts 'whatever deed a man does in four ways viz. with eye, with thought, speech or action, he receives (in return) that same kind of action; a man does not enjoy (i. e. experience the results of) the good deeds or evil deeds of another; man attains (a result) in consonance with the actions done by himself'.[2578] Similarly, in the Gṛdhra-gomāyu-saṁvāda, it is asserted 'the son does not have to go by the path due to the actions of the father, nor *vice versa*, they being bound by their own respective good or evil deeds proceed each by a different path'. Whatever deed a man does, whether holy or very unholy (terrible), the consequences of that are experienced by the doer alone, what have the relatives to do with that' (Śāntiparva 153. 38 and 41 = cr. ed. 149. 34 and 37).

Modifications of this doctrine were early introduced. The Gaut.[2579] Dh. S. provides that the king should guard all the

---

2577. अव द्रुग्धानि पित्र्या सृजा नोऽव या वयं चकृमा तनूभिः । ऋ. VII. 86 5; मा व एनो अन्यकृतं भुजेम मा तत्कर्म वसवो यच्चयध्वे । ऋ. VI. 51. 7; ऋ. VII. 52. 2 practically repeats this 'मा वो भुजेमान्यजातमेनो मा तत्कर्म वसवो यच्चयध्वे ॥.'

2578. चक्षुषा मनसा वाचा कर्मणा च चतुर्विधम् । कुरुते यादृशं कर्म तादृशं प्रतिपद्यते ॥ नायं परस्य सुकृतं दुष्कृतं चापि सेवते । करोति यादृशं कर्म तादृशं प्रतिपद्यते ॥ शान्तिपर्व 279. 15 and 21 (= 290. 16, 22 of Ch. ed.)

2579. Vide also शान्तिपर्व 287. 28 (= ch. ed. 298. 30); वर्णानाश्रमांश्च न्यायतोऽभिरक्षेत् । चलतश्चैतान् स्वधर्मे स्थापयेत् । धर्मस्य ह्यंशभाग्भवतीति । गौ. XI. 9-11.

varṇas and *āśramas* according to Śāstra and if they swerve from their duties he should make them follow their duties, since he gets a share of the dharma (merit) observed by them. Manu provides (VIII. 304–305, 308) that the king who protects his subjects secures the sixth part of the (spiritual) merit of all (his subjects), but if he does not guard them he also shares in the sixth part of their *adharma* (sin); the king who protects well is entitled to the sixth part of the merit of the Veda study, the sacrifices, the gifts, and of the worship of gods done by all subjects; that king who takes as his one-sixth part of the crops and other products, but fails to guard the subjects is declared (by sages) as receiving all the sins of all his subjects'. Manu says elsewhere (in IX. 301) that the king is the Yuga, that his actions may bring in Kṛta or any of the other Yugas. Kālidāsa in Śākuntala echoes this idea.[2580] Manu (in VIII. 316) provides that when a thief comes to a king, confesses his guilt and asks the king to punish him with a heavy staff or a sharp weapon and the king either punishes him or lets him off, the thief is freed from (the effects of) the sin, but the king incurs the guilt of the thief if he does not punish him. To the same effect is Vasiṣṭha 19. 46 and 20. 41. It was stated by Manu (III. 100) that all the merit of even a man who lives a plain life by subsisting on grains left in the field after the crops are garnered and who performs homa in the five fires (to be kept by an householder) is taken away by a brāhmaṇa guest who stays unhonoured by him. Śāntiparva, Viṣṇu Dh. S. and several Purāṇas provide that[2581] when a guest, being disappointed (in getting food), turns away from the house of a person, the guest goes away taking all the merit of the person and transfers to him all his own misdeeds. This was probably not meant to be taken literally. It is only an arthavāda (in the language of the Mīmāṁsā) and merely exhorts a householder to honour a guest properly. The exhortation addressed by the judge to a witness before the latter began to depose contains in Yāj. the following

---

2580. सर्वतो धर्मषड्भागो राज्ञो भवति रक्षतः । अधर्मादपि षड्भागो भवत्यस्य ह्यरक्षतः ॥ मनु VIII. 304; compare शाकुन्तल II. 14 'यदुत्तिष्ठति वर्णेभ्यो नृपाणां क्षयि तत्फलम् । तपःषड्भागमक्षय्यं ददत्यारण्यका हि नः ॥.'

2581. अतिथिर्यस्य भग्नाशो गृहात्प्रतिनिवर्तते । स तस्मै दुष्कृतं दत्त्वा पुण्यमादाय गच्छति ॥ शान्तिपर्व 184. 12 (expressly quoted) as a श्लोक = Cb. ed. 191. 12), विष्णुधर्मसूत्र 67. 33, विष्णुपुराण III. 9. 15 and III. 11. 68, वराहपुराण 170. 46 (with variations).

verse [2582]: 'whatever good deeds you performed in hundreds of existences, all that will go to that party whose defeat you will bring about by your false evidence.' The Mit. and Aparārka both say that this is meant only to frighten and quote a verse of Nārada (ṛṇādāna 200) in support 'he (the judge) should frighten them (from telling lies) by citing ancient dharmaśāstra texts, by recounting the greatness of truth and by censuring falsehood.' Manu (VIII. 90), however, makes the exhortation run as follows 'Whatever good deeds you performed from your birth, the merit of all of them would go to dogs if you will depose falsely'. Manu XII. 81 says [2583] 'with whatever disposition of mind (either *sāttvika* or *rājasa* or *tāmasa*) a man does an act he reaps the fruits thereof (in a future life) in a body endowed with the same character.'

The Bhagavadgītā, apart from the fact that knowledge of reality destroyed the effects of all deeds, emphasized at the end the path of singleminded devotion (*bhakti*) to God and surrendering all one's acts and their fruits to Him 'giving up all the various paths, come to me alone as your refuge; don't grieve, I shall release you from the consequences of all evil deeds, if any, of yours'. [2584]

As regards husband and wife, the Dharmaśāstra works say a good deal but all that is said should not be taken literally. For example, Manu (V. 164–166) states [2585] 'by playing false to her husband (i. e. by adultery) the wife is censured in this world, she becomes (after death) a female jackal and is tormented by evil diseases (such as leprosy). That woman controlling herself in thought, word and deed, who does not play false to her

---

2582 सुकृतं यत्त्वया किञ्चिज्जन्मान्तरशतैः कृतम्। तत्सर्वं तस्य जानीहि यं पराजयसे मृषा ॥ या. II. 75; the मिता० says: अन्यस्यानेकजन्मार्जितसुकृतसंक्रमणस्य महापातकादिफलप्राप्तेश्चानृतवचनमात्रेणानुपपत्तेः साक्षिसंत्रासार्थमिदमुच्यते। यथाह नारदः। पुराणैर्धर्मवचनैः सत्यमाहात्म्यकीर्तनैः। अनृतस्यापवादैश्च भृशमुत्त्रासयेदिमान् ॥ इति ॥.

2583. यादृशेन तु भावेन यद्यत्कर्म निषेवते। तादृशेन शरीरेण तत्तत्फलमुपाश्नुते ॥ मनु XII. 81.

2584. सर्वधर्मान्परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज। अहं त्वा सर्वपापेभ्यो मोक्षयिष्यामि मा शुचः ॥ भगवद्गीता 18.63. Here dharma does not mean 'religion' but paths which are deemed to lead to man's goal and many of which are set out in Śāntiparva 342.10–16 (= Ch. ed. 354. 10–16), such as mokṣdharma, yajña-dharma, rājadharma, ahiṁsādharma. The last verse in that chapter is 'एवं बहुविधैर्लोकैर्धर्मद्वारैरनावृतैः। ममापि मतिराविग्ना मेघलेखेव वायुना ॥'

2585. मनु V. 164–165 are repeated in मनु IX. 30, 29.

husband, resides in the same world (heaven) as her husband, and is called a virtuous wife. A woman restrained in thought, word and deed, secures by such conduct (as is laid down for her) in this life highest renown and residence with her husband in the next world'. For hyperbolical descriptions of the power of a chaste wife (*pativratā*) in the great epic and Purāṇas, vide H. of Dh. vol. II. pp. 567–568. A verse cited there may be repeated here 'just as a snake-charmer forcibly draws out from a hole a snake, so a chaste wife snatches away her husband's life from the messengers of death and reaches heaven with her husband'. This is also an *arthavāda* but it probably reflected the popular ideas of those times.

The Mahābhārata has certain interesting verses on the transference of the effects of *karma* to one's descendants. The Ādiparva states 'if the consequences of sin are not seen affecting the perpetrator, they will surely be seen in the sons or grandsons'. This again is an *arthavāda.*[2586]

It was believed that punishment by the king for a sinful deed (like a theft &c.) liquidated the consequences of the sin, made the offender pure and enabled him to reach heaven as men of good deeds do.[2587]

It is difficult to reconcile the doctrine of Karma and punarjanma with the system of Śrāddhas in which balls of rice are offered to the three paternal ancestors of the performer of śrāddha. This subject has been dealt with in H. of Dh. vol. IV. pp. 335–339. The offering of balls of rice to the spirits of the departed male ancestors was in vogue in the times of the Veda probably and even before the Vedas and the theory of Karma and Punar-janma arose later and as people were not prepared to give up the theory of śrāddhas, they kept both.

The popular idea of the last thought at one's death leading to a future birth appropriate to that thought in spite of a life of sin and iniquity is an interference with the working of the law of Karma and transmigration. This notion has been dealt with

---

2586. नाधर्मश्चरितो ... कृन्तति ॥ पुत्रेषु वा नप्तृषु वा न चेदात्मनि पश्यति । फलत्येव ध्रुवं पापं गुरुभुक्तमिवोदरे ॥ आदि 80: 2–3; the first has been quoted above on p. 1561 note 2532; to the same effect is शान्ति 139.22 (= cr. ed. 137.19) पापं कर्म कृतं किञ्चिद्यदि तस्मिन् न दृश्यते । नृपते तस्य पुत्रेषु पौत्रेष्वपि च नप्तृषु ॥

2587. राजभिः कृतदण्डास्तु कृत्वा पापानि मानवाः । निर्मलाः स्वर्गमायान्ति सन्तः सुकृतिनो यथा ॥ मनु VIII. 318 = वसिष्ठ 19.45 (reads धृतदण्डास्तु).

above (pp. 972–973) where it has been pointed out that that notion is not supported by the Bhagavadgītā (VIII. 5–7).

Apart from the Upaniṣads (and commentaries thereon), the Vedāntasūtras (and the bhāṣyas thereon) and the Bhagavadgītā, there are very few regular treatises on the doctrine of Karma and re-incarnation. One work comparatively early in date is the Vijñānadīpikā of Padmapāda (said to be the same as the favourite pupil of the first Śaṅkarācārya) in 71 verses (edited with a commentary and Introduction by M. M. Dr. Umesha Mishra, Allahabad, 1940) which deal with the means of achieving *mokṣa* by realizing the identity of the individual self and the Supreme Self (they being like the reflection and its original) and by annihilating karma. Some of the important verses in it have been adduced above in the notes. That work (verse 9)[2588] compares sañcīyamāna-karma to grain standing in the field, *sañcita* to grain stored in one's house and prārabdha-karma to food put in one's stomach. The food put in one's stomach is exhausted by its being digested which takes some time. Therefore, Karma of the sañcita and sañcīyamāna types is annihilated by correct knowledge, while prārabdha karma by undergoing its results for some time. It emphasizes that it is *Vairāgya* (extreme non-attachment to objects of sense) that leads to the rise of correct knowledge of Reality, to the elimination of *vāsanās* (unconsciously working impressions), to the annihilation of Karma and to cessation of rebirth.

Another work is the Janma-maraṇavicāra of Bhaṭṭa Vāmadeva (published in the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies vol. 19, 1918 A. D.). It is a small work in 25 pages.[2589] It appears to belong to the Kashmir Śaiva cult. It states that Śiva has three Śaktis, Cit-śakti (which is of the nature of light or consciousness), Svātantrya (free will, independence) and

---

2588. उभयोर्ज्ञानतो नाशो भोगात्प्रारब्धकर्मणः। क्षेत्रागारोदरस्थानामन्नानामिव तद्विदा॥ वैराग्याज्ज्ञानसम्पत्तिर्वैराग्याद्वासनाक्षयः। वैराग्यात्कर्मनाशश्च कर्मनाशाज्जनेर्लयः॥ वि. दी. verses 9 and 16. The com. remarks : क्षेत्रस्थितमन्नं सञ्चीयमानं गृहस्थितमन्नं सञ्चितम्। उदरस्थितमन्नं प्रारब्धम्। तत्र क्षेत्रागारस्थितयोरन्नयोर्दानादिना तात्कालिकक्षयोपि सम्भवति। उदरस्थान्नस्य तु भोगात् कालपरिपाकादेव क्षयः।

2589. The ms. of this work was copied in Laukika year 4603 i. e. 1527 A. D. The author was a disciple of योगीश्वराचार्य, probably the same as Yogarāja, who wrote a commentary on the Paramārthasāra of Abhinavagupta. So he flourished probably about 1050–1100 A. D. and at any :rate before 1500 A. D.

Ānandaśakti (bliss). There are six *kañcukas* (sheaths, covers) viz. Māyā, Kalā, Śuddha-vidyā, Rāga, Kāla and Niyantraṇā. On p. 15 it says that when the bodily machine is broken, consciousness, taking hold of *prāṇana* (breathing), is carried to another body by the Ātivāhika (subtle body).[2590] This latter body becomes like a vehicle between the body that lies dead and the next physical body. The work then quotes from a Kośabhāṣya three verses which support the theory of the antarābhavadeha (the intermediate body between the dead physical body and the future physical body) and also relies on Ṛg. X. 85. 16.[2591] It also quotes Bhagavadgītā 14. 14–15 (yadā sattve pravṛddhe tu &c) and says that those bodily states are referred to in such Vedic passages as 'Pañcāre cakre &c' (Ṛg. X. 164. 13), in Kaṭhopaniṣad I. 6 (sasyam-iva martyaḥ pacyate), in 'Vāsāṁsi jīrṇāni' (Gītā II. 22). He further says that by God's grace a man becomes pure and by *dīkṣā* and other means he understands his real character and reaches Śiva. It states that all men do not attain liberation, while those who hate (discard) *dīkṣā*, temples and correct knowledge go to hell. There is very little discussion about the kinds of Karma and the removal of the effects of these.

There is another rather modern work called Prārabdha-dhvānta-saṁhṛti (destruction of the darkness i. e. ignorance about *prārabdha*) composed in *śaka* 1741 (1819 A. D.) at Pañcavaṭī near Nasik by Acyutarāya Moḍaka, a learned and prolific writer. The only known ms. is in the Mysore Government

---

2590. V.S. IV. 3.4, is 'ātivāhikās-tallingāt' and for 'antarābhavadeha', vide Ślokavārtika (ātmavāda, verse 62 p. 704 q. above in n. 2254 p. 1376) and न्या. र. यदप्यातिवाहिकं नाम शरीरं पूर्वोत्तरदेहयोरन्तराले ज्ञानसन्तानसन्धारणार्थं कल्प्यते तदपि विन्ध्यवासिना निराकृतमित्याह । अन्तरेति ।

2591. द्वे ते चक्रे सूर्ये ब्रह्माण ऋतुथा विदुः । अथैकं चक्रं यद्गुहा तदद्धातय इद्विदुः ॥ ऋ. X. 85.16. This literally means 'O Sūryā (daughter of the Sun)! two are thy wheels which the brāhmaṇas (or priests) know as coming at proper seasons; one of the wheels is inside a cave and is known only to *addhātis* (wise men?).' Acc. to Sāyaṇa here Sūryā addresses herself. The two wheels are the Sun and the Moon and the wheel in the 2nd half is a third one viz. the year. The Nighaṇṭu includes 'addhātayaḥ' among the twenty-four words meaning 'medhāvin' (III. 15). That word occurs only here in the whole of the Ṛgveda. The work explains 'Sūryā' as 'ātmaśakti' and takes 'cakra' as meaning 'body'; two bodies would be 'the present and the future body' and it holds that addhātayaḥ means 'yogins' and 'guhā' (in the cave) suggests that one body cannot be seen but is only known to yogins. That one body is the *ātivāhika* body according to this writer.

Oriental Library and is in Kannaḍa script. The present author got a Devanāgarī transcript of the Ms. through the kindness of the authorities of the Library.

Dr. H. G. Narahari (in N. I. A. vol. V. pp. 115–118) furnishes an account of the ms., its date and a brief description of its contents. In another paper the same scholar gives a tolerably full analysis of its contents (in J. G. J. R. I. vol. III. for 1945-46, pp. 349–367).

The author Acyutarāya states that the work really means 'Prārabdha-vāda-dhvāntasaṁhṛti' (destruction of the darkness caused by the doctrine of prārabdha) and that all that he wants is to combat the false idea that all human acts from the moment of conception to death are governed by past deeds alone to the exclusion of everything else. He postulates that all human activity is due to *prārabdha*, to *saṁskāras* (sub-conscious or latent impressions or tendencies) and *prayatna* (human effort). He explains : the moment after the body dies, all the accumulated good and bad deeds set in motion by God become ready to yield their retribution (results) and that a good or evil deed (or both) that is strongest begins a suitable body. The birth is that of a brāhmaṇa or the rest when there is mixed good and evil as the strongest karma, as a lower animal when sin is strongest, as a godly birth when a good deed is strongest. The duration of life may be 100 years, less or more, and *bhoga* means experiencing pleasure or pain that is regarded as favourable or unfavourable.[2592] Then he launches on the discussion of pleasure (*sukha*) as threefold, viz. illusory (prātibhāsika), actual (vyāvahārika) or actual due to illusory pleasure. Pleasure is again *ramya* (beautiful) and *priya* (dear or liked). These two are not synonymous, since gold would appear beautiful to an ascetic but it is not dear to him. Then he divides what is *priya* into three kinds (or degrees). He divides each of the three kinds of pleasure into three varieties, which are passed over here. The preceding are classifications of pleasure that is 'Laukikakārya' (ordinary or common); but there are also other sukhas, viz. *vaidika* [fourfold such as pratīkopāsanā, āhārya (assumed) and *vāsanātmaka*

2592. प्रारब्धकरणकः संस्कारकरणकः प्रयत्नकरणकश्चापि निरुक्तव्यवहारः । देहपातव्यवहितोत्तरक्षणे परमेश्वरप्रेरितानि सर्वाणि सञ्चितपुण्यपापानि फलदानोन्मुखानि भवन्ति । तेषां मध्ये यद् बलवत्पुण्यं पापं वोभयं वा तज्जातिदेहमारभज्जात्यायुर्भोगदं प्रारब्धमित्युच्यते । तत्र जातिर्ब्राह्मणादिर्मिश्रे तिर्यक्त्वादि पापे देवत्वादिः पुण्ये । आयुः शतवर्षादि यथायथम् । भोगस्त्वनुकूलप्रतिकूलवेदनीयलक्षणयोः सुखदुःखयोः साक्षात्कार एव । pp. 4–5 of the transcript. He relies on the योगसूत्र II. 13 सति मूले तद्विपाको जात्यायुर्भोगाः ।.

(as in sleep)]. This last he subdivides into three kinds (sāttvika, rājasa and tāmasa) that are passed over. Pain (duḥkha) is divisible in the same way as sukha and the author illustrates the different kinds of pain, that are left out here. Then the author dilates upon the cause or causes of pleasure and pain (sukha and duḥkha) that constitute man's experience on earth, which causes are prārabdha (past *karma* that has begun to operate and determines the body the soul secures), *saṁskāra* and *prayatna*.[2593] He states that the bliss that a man feels in meditation (samādhi) is due to *prārabdha*, the pleasure he feels in deep sleep is due to saṁskāras[2594] and the pleasure on the fall of rain after the performance of the Kārīrī (sacrifice) is due to human effort From the Upanisad passages it follows (says Acyutarāya) that in deep sleep there is no desire, no karma and no fear and so the pleasure (expressed on waking in the words 'sukham-ahamasvāpsam' (I had a happy sleep) is not due to prārabdha but to saṁskāras. He relies on the Bṛ. Up.[2595] (IV. 4. 2) for holding this view (i. e. he takes 'pūrvaprajñā' in that passage as equal to *vāsanā* ('latent impressions or reminiscences of past experiences). The activities of a person in past lives may be madhya[2596] (middling or moderate),

---

2593. एवमेतादृशसुखदुःखयोर्मनुष्यादीनां भोगः प्रारब्धतः संस्कारतः प्रयत्नतश्च भवति। p. 14 of transcript.

2594. The छान्दोग्योप० avers that in deep sleep man's soul loses personal consciousness and becomes merged in the *Sat* (the True, *brahma*). उद्दालको हारुणिः श्वेतकेतुं पुत्रमुवाच। स्वप्नान्तं मे सोम्य विजानीहीति। यत्रैतत्पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम सता सोम्य तदा संपन्नो भवति। तस्मादेनं स्वपितीत्याचक्षते। स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति। छा. उप. VI. 8.1. In स्वपिति, स्व means 'his own i. e. Self', पिति represents अपीत (absorbed). अपीति or अप्यय means लय. The वे. सू. I. 1, 9 (स्वाप्ययात्) and IV. 4. 16 are based on this Chāndogya text; compare बृह. उप. IV. 3. 19 यत्र 'सुप्तो न कंचन कामं कामयते न कंचन स्वप्नं पश्यति.'

2595. तमुत्क्रामन्तं प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति। ... तं विद्याकर्मणी समन्वारभेते पूर्वप्रज्ञा च। बृह. उप. IV. 4.2, quoted by अच्युतराय on p. 16 of the transcript. शङ्कराचार्य explains: तं परलोकाय गच्छन्तमात्मानं ... विद्या च कर्म च ... विद्या सर्वप्रकारा विहिता प्रतिषिद्धा च अविहिता अप्रतिषिद्धा च तथा कर्म विहितं प्रतिषिद्धं च अविहितमप्रतिषिद्धं च समन्वारभेते ... अनुगच्छतः। पूर्वप्रज्ञा च। पूर्वानुभूतविषया प्रज्ञा पूर्वप्रज्ञा अतीतकर्मफलानुभववासनेत्यर्थः।'. वे. सू. III. 4.5 and 11 refer to this passage and explain it. अच्युतराय quotes a verse: कर्मणः क्रियमाणस्य संस्कारो यो हृदि स्थितः। तत्फलस्य च भुक्तस्य पूर्वप्रज्ञेति सोच्यते॥ (which is बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्-भाष्यवार्तिक p. 1743, verse 118) p. 17 transcript. पूर्वप्रज्ञा (knowledge or acquaintance with former things) is postulated for explaining the peculiar genius or deficiency observed in children.

2596. एवं मध्यमन्दतीव्राभिधान्यपि जन्मान्तरीयकर्माण्येव तारतम्यात्तथा तथोच्यन्ते। तत्र त्रिपादसात्त्विकमेकपादराजसं पुण्यं मध्यम्। एवं द्विपाद-सात्त्विक द्विपादराजसमपि

(*Continued on next page*)

manda (inferior), tīvra (formidable). A good deed which is three parts sāttvika and one part rājasa is called madhya; a deed which is half sāttvika and half rājasa is tīvra. Then Acyutarāya refers to a conflict of views. Following the words 'puṇyo vai puṇyena karmaṇā bhavati pāpaḥ pāpena' (Bṛ. Up. III. 3. 13 quoted in note 2510 above), some writers held that it is only Karma that is the cause of a new birth and that vidyā (knowledge of all kinds) and pūrvaprajñā have nothing to do with it, while others relying on Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 2 (to which reference is made in the Saṅkṣepaśārīraka III. 18) held that Vidyā, Karma and Pūrvaprajñā have all to do with the assumption of a new body by the soul. Achyutarāya agrees with this latter view. He divides and subdivides Karma, vidyā and pūrvaprajñā, so that ultimately the threefold apparatus for giving a new body comes to 96 varieties and remarks that these divisions are not of much use.[2597] To the objection that all this refutation of prārabdhavāda is idle and serves no purpose he replies: men are of three sorts, mukta (liberated), mumukṣu (desirous of liberation) and viṣayin (immersed in enjoying the objects of sense). As regards the first the Chān. Up. VI. 14. 2 says 'for him there is delay so long as he is not delivered (from the body), then he will be perfect'.[2598] The same is relied upon in V. S. IV. 1. 19. The idea being that until prārabdhakarma that brought about the body in which Realisation was attained is done away with by the death of the body, the self is jīvanmukta, but his other karma that has not begun to yield fruit is done away with by Realisation, To the same effect is Bhagavadgītā.

Acyutarāya quotes thirteen verses from Vārtikasāra about Vāsanā (pūrvaprajñā), Karma and Vidyā (pp. 31-33). He

---

(*Continued from last page*)

किंचित्पापोपसृष्टं तीव्रमिति । p. 18 transcript. There is *some mistake in making* this transcript.' Probably a line is omitted. What is half Sāttvika and half rājasa and slightly affected by visciousness should be called *manda* and *tīvra* should be described as one part sāttvika and three parts rājasa and predominantly sinful.

2597. एतदुदाहरणानि तु पूर्वाचार्योक्तविशेष स्वयमेवोह्यानि विस्तरभयादनति-प्रयोजनत्वाच्च नेह विविच्यन्ते । p. 29 (transcript).

2598. तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये इति । छा. उप. VI. 14.2. विमोक्ष्ये and संपत्स्ये are in the first person singular. The father Āruṇi instructs the son Śvetaketu. When he reaches the stage of describing the step of Mokṣa due to realisation he passes on to the first person from the third and states about himself 'I shall become mukta and perfect at that stage.'

quotes the Jīvanmuktiviveka on the three means of jīvanmukti viz. *tattvajñāna* (knowledge of the Reality as enunciated in 'Tat-tvamasi' Chān. Up. VI. 8. 7, 'Aham brahmāsmi' Bṛ. Up. I. 4. 10), *manonāśa* (disappearance of the activities of the mind) and *Vāsanākṣaya* (destruction of the instincts of anger &c). Then he gives a lengthy disquisition on the condemnation of prārabdhavāda and the superiority of effort from the Vāsiṣṭha-Rāmāyaṇa. About *mumukṣu* Acyutarāya advises going to a guru as laid down in Muṇḍakopaniṣad I. 2. 12 (tadvijñānārtham sa gurumevābhigacchet &c).

The present author has read either wholly or partially the following modern works, mostly written by Western scholars on Karma and rebirth, that either offer remarks for or against that doctrine. The space at the author's disposal precludes any detailed statement about the objections raised against this doctrine in some of them. But a few important objections will be stated and will be briefly dealt with. The works read or consulted are: "Philosophy of the Upanishads" by Paul Deussen, translated by A. S. Geden (1906) pp. 313-338; J. R. A.S. for 1906 pp. 586-593 and for 1907 pp. 665-72 on modifications of the doctrine of Karma by E. W. Hopkins; 'Transmigration of souls' by Alfred Berthelot, translated by H. J. Chaytor (Harper, London, 1909); 'Karma and redemption' by A. G. Hogg (ed. of 1910); 'Religion and immortality' by G. Lowes Dickinson (Dent, 1911); 'Re-incarnation' by E.D. Walker (Rider and Co., London, 1913); this book contains extracts from Western authors (22 in number) on re-incarnation (pp. 63-124); there is also a long chapter (pp. 127-191) of extracts from Western Poetry on the same subject; he also deals with evidences of the doctrine in the Bible and early Christendom and a Bibliography on pp. 329-343; 'Fate and free will' by Ardesar Sorabji N. Wadia (Dent and Sons, London 1915). He states the problem to be 'whether fate by itself influences and directs the course of human evolution or freewill by itself or both fate and freewill working conjointly lay down the lines along which human progress must lie'. He states that it must be the one or the other and that it can never be both (p. 180). He himself believes in a fixed and determinist future; 'Immortality' essays on, by B.H. Streeter and others (Macmillan & Co. 1917); pp. 293-317 deal with re-incarnation and Karma by Miss Lily Dougall and pp. 317-341 deal with modern Theosophy which adopts the doctrines of re-incarnation and Karma; 'Religion and philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads' by A. B. Keith, vol. II. pp. 570-584; 'Karma and re-

incarnation' by Paul Yevtic (Luzac & Co., London, 1927); L'Ame et le Dogme de la Transmigration dans les Livres Sacres de L'Inde ancienne' by Eric de Henseler, Paris, 1928; 'Some dogmas of Religion' by McTaggart with Introduction by C. D. Broad (London, 1930 pp. 77–111 on 'Human Immortality'), pp. 112–139 on human pre-existence, pp. 140–185 on Free Will; 'Vicissitudes of karma doctrine' by Prof. H. D. Bhattacharya in Malaviya Commemoration Volume (1932) pp. 491–526; 'Reincarnation for every man' by Shaw Desmond (Rider & Co., London). This work mentions in chap. VIII European great men that believed in this doctrine; 'The scales of karma' by Owen Rutter (London). This book contains numerous references to Greek and Roman writers and to modern English and German poets and philosophers from whose works extracts are cited for showing that they believed in Karma and reincarnation such as Shakespeare, Hume, Goethe, Wordsworth; 'Indian Philosophy', by Dr.S. Radhakrishnan (1941) pp. 244–249; 'The circle of life' by Kenneth Walker (Jonathan Cape, London, 1942) chap. VIII and IX pp. 81–104; 'Karma and re-birth' by Christmas Humphreys (London, 1944); in chap. VII. pp. 62–66 he tries to show that Schopenhauer, Tennyson, Browning, Rossetti and John Masefield, the English Poet Laureate, believe in this doctrine; 'The problem of re-birth' by Sri Aurobindo (Pondicherry, 1952); 'The Brahmasūtras' by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan (1959), pp. 194–207 of the Introduction; 'The dogma of re-incarnation' by J. E. Sanjana (New Book Co., Bombay, 1954) pp. 1–134 with an Appendix on the rationale of the dogma of rebirth, pp. 137–157. This is one of the largest and latest works on 're-incarnation' that the present author read. Mr. Sanjana writes bitterly and sometimes in offensive language about those from whom he differs. He asserts that he is a true Zoroastrian and that 'it can be said without any exaggeration and with the most perfect reason and justice that a man who believes in re-incarnation is not a true Zoroastrian' (p. 125). None need quarrel with his first belief, but the latter part of the sentence invites serious consideration. He appears to aver that he has a monopoly of the true doctrines of Zoroastrianism and like the Roman Church and the Popes, that held that the true religion was only in their keeping and that all others (even those who believed in the Bible and Christ) were damned, holds that Zoroastrians believing in re-incarnation are apostates. I shall cite only one or two Parsi scholars who hold just the opposite view. Mr. R. F. Gorvala contributed a paper on the "Immortal Soul, its pre-existence,

persistence after death and transmigration" to the Spiegel Commemoration Volume edited by no less a Parsi scholar than Dr. J. J. Modi (Bombay, 1908) pp. 99–124, in which he states (p. 124) 'that the Hindu doctrine of the transmigration of the soul influenced the faith of the ancient Zoroastrians *in all times.* Indeed the struggle between Good and Evil could not end in the triumph of the former if but one brief life was the only time given for the fight.' *Vide also* 'Philosophy of Zoroastrianism' by Faredun K. Dadachanji (Bombay, Times of India Press, 1941) pp. 108–133, particularly pp. 116 ff. Mr. Sanjana seems to have been much upset by the fact that some Parsis, who were scholars of Avesta and Sanskrit, became Theosophists and admirers of Mrs. Besant and other famous personages in the Theosophist movement. Nearly half the main book of 129 pages is concerned with the criticisms (sometimes extremely offensive) of the doings and writings of Madame Blavatsky (pp. 28–42), Mrs. Besant (pp. 43–51), C. W. Leadbeater (pp. 57–59), A. P. Sinnett and others (like Col. Olcott and Mr. K. A. K. Iyer, author of 'Vedanta), W. Q. Judge and a Gujarati book of an unnamed scholar (pp. 59–73). On pp. 82–88 he deals with McTaggart, G. L. Dickinson and W. Lutosowski (Polish writer who claims that he remembers his many past lives). Mr. Sanjana returns (pp. 89–103) to the charge against the Theosophists and the storms aud eruptions in the Theosophical society and considers some works on Sufism also (pp. 106–115). He emphasises the good points of Zoroastrianism as certified by W. B. Henning, J. W. Waterhouse and Hopkins. He does not devote much thought to the objections, more or less insuperable, against all monotheistic religions with a personal God in such works as Hobhouse's 'Morals in Evolution' part 2, though in the appendix (on p. 140) he has to admit that no satisfactory answer can be given to the question why an omnipotent and omniscient God should allow Evil to exist. He contrasts Zoroaster's religion and philosophy with Hinduism and Buddhism and winds up with an article by Winternitz (pp. 119–121) and then ends on an illuminating personal note in which he confesses (p. 126) that he in his youth was particularly attracted by the doctrine of re-incarnation eloquently propounded by Mrs. Besant, but later he became sceptical about what was said by Mrs. Besant. Neophytes generally indulge in opprobrious language for the cult once ardently professed by them and later abjured and Mr. Sanjana seems to be no exception to this. I may mention here only one or two instances of his language against Theosophists;

on p. 64 he speaks of Blavatsky, Mrs. Besant, Sinnett and Leadbeater as "proved charlatans" and on p. 95 he writes about Mrs. Besant's entry into Politics as "these later metamorphoses of the megalomaniac Mrs. Besant". It appears to the present writer that his study of original Sanskrit works is not deep and that he commits serious mistakes in the small portion of his work that he devotes to the ancient Indian view of the doctrine of re-incarnation. His wrong interpretation of Manu VI. 63 (p. 10 of his book) has been pointed out (on p. 1565). Some more cases of mistakes may be cited here. On p. 11 of his book he relies on Thibaut for the statement that there is nothing in the sūtras (the Vedānta-sūtras) to warrant the main doctrine of Śaṅkara about two Vidyās, the higher (*parā*) and the lower (*aparā*), which respectively lead to the higher (para) *brahma* and the lower (apara) brahma. If he had carefully read only a few of the eleven principal Upaniṣads (the Īśāvāsya, Kena, Kaṭha, Muṇḍaka, Praśna) he would have found for himself that Thibaut is not a trustworthy guide in all cases. The Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (I. 1. 4–5) speaks of two vidyās, parā and aparā 'dve vidye veditavye parā ca, aparā ca, atha parā yayā tadakṣaram adhigamyate' and this Muṇḍaka text is treated as the basis of Vedāntasūtra I. 2. 21–23 by Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja. The Praśna Upaniṣad 2 states both *para* and *apara brahma* 'etadvai Satyakāma param cāparam ca brahma yad-oṁkāraḥ". On pp. 21, 121, 146 he alleges that the words "yadahareva virajet tadahareva pravrajet" (a man should become a sannyāsin the very day on which he feels disgust for this worldly life) are a dictum or saying of Śaṅkara. But this text is taken from the Jābālopaniṣad 4. The whole passage of the Jābālopaniṣad 4 on the āśramas is quoted by Śaṅkara on Vedāntasūtra III. 4. 20 and Śaṅkara calls it Jābālaśruti. On p. 22 Mr. Sanjana quotes Bhagavadgītā (IX. 32, 'mām hi pārtha vyapāśritya yepi syuḥ pāpayonayaḥ, striyo vaiśyās-tathā śudrās-tepi yānti parām gatim) and holds that women, vaiśyas and śūdras are declared to be included under 'pāpayonayaḥ' (of evil or sinful birth). This is quite wrong. A Vaiśya from very ancient times belonged to the three higher classes and in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad V. 10. 7, it is expressly stated that Vaiśyayoni is of good birth (those whose conduct has been good will quickly attain some good birth, the birth of a brāhmaṇa or of a kṣatriya or of a vaiśya, but those whose conduct has been evil will attain an evil birth, the birth of a dog or a hog or a cāṇḍāla'. So vaiśya's was good

birth in Chān. Upaniṣad. Women of the higher classes could not study the Veda in medieval times but women of the three higher classes co-operated with their husbands in all religious rites (including Vedic sacrifices). Therefore, the Gītā first mentions the worst case viz. that of Cāṇḍālas and affirms that even Cāṇḍālas (who belonged to the lowest class) would attain the highest goal if they surrendered themselves as devotees to God and then adds three more classes of people viz. women, vaiśyas and śūdras. A Śūdra was never among untouchables; on the contrary, early Smṛtis like Manu VI. 253, Yājñavalkya I. 166, Parāśara XI. 19 provide that a brāhmaṇa could take food at the house of a śūdra provided the latter was born of his slave woman or cultivated the brāhmaṇa's fields on the rent of half share of crops or was the friend of his family or tended his cattle or was his barber. In medieval times (after the 5th or 6th century A.D.), however, the caste system became more rigid but even up to the 12th century A.D. a brāhmaṇa could take food at a śūdra's house in extreme calamity (vide History of Dharmaśāstra, vol. III. pp. 952–53). Thereafter this was forbidden and was included among Kalivarjya acts. The vaiśyas are probably equated with women and śūdras because in their pursuit of wealth they never cared to study the Veda and Upaniṣads. Other passages of Mr. Sanjana's work are not cited for criticism for reasons of space.

Some of the objections raised by Western thinkers and writers against the doctrine of Karma and re-incarnation will now be mentioned and briefly dealt with. One or two preliminary matters have to be emphasized. Many in the West regard our life after the death of the bodies as certain, but hardly anyone of them regards our life before our present bodies as a possibility. The explanation of this attitude of many Western thinkers lies in the fact that in modern Western thought the great support of the belief in immortality of the soul has been the Christian religion, which is supposed not to recognize the pre-existence of the soul. Besides, Christian writers from Augustine onwards firmly believed that religious truths outside the revelation in the Bible as interpreted by them were a work of the devil. McTaggart in 'Some Dogmas of religion' (London, 1930) attacks this attitude. He holds (p. 113) that any evidence which will prove immortality will also prove pre-existence and that there is nothing in pre-existence that is incompatible with any of the dogmas that are generally accepted as fundamental

to Christianity.' L. P. Jacks in 'Near the brink' (Allen and Unwin, London, 1952, pp. 10–11) holds the same opinion (at the age of 92) as McTaggart's. Wordsworth in his famous Ode appears to agree that the present life is preceded by another existence when he says 'Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting, the soul that rises with us, our life's star, had elsewhere its setting and cometh from afar.' L. P. Jacks in the work mentioned above remarks (on p. 9) that an endless punishment is not, strictly speaking, a punishment at all but an exercise of cruelty or vengeance and that the same is true of an endless reward.

The first objection raised against the doctrine of Karma by Pringle-Pattison in 'Idea of immortality' (Oxford, 1922) is that absence of memory of the pre-existence is fatal to it (p. 112) and that immortality without recollection is quite useless. Miss Lily Dougall in 'Immortality' by Canon Streeter and others raises a similar objection (p. 29). This objection can be answered in various ways. Does any one remember anything of what one did during the first two years of his life? It is also well-known that men do not correctly remember in old age even the names of their grand-children nor does a man remember what he did exactly ten years ago during his present life. It is rather merciful that there is no memory of past lives. If all the multifarious memories of many lives were to crowd on us in the present life, our minds would be confused and matters in the present life would be very much complicated. Karma is a cosmic law like the law of gravitation. The latter was not recognized by humanity for thousands of years but all the same it existed and worked. Several people claim to remember their past lives. The story of Śāntidevī was published as a case of re-incarnation by Lala Deshbhandhu Gupta, Pandit Nekiram Sharma, and Tarachand Mathur. The 'Theosophist Monthly' for January 1925 mentions concrete instances of the memory of past lives. 'The lives of Alcyone' (Adyar, 1924) is a work in two volumes by Mrs. Besant and Mr. Leadbeater in which 48 lives are traced from 70000 B. C. to 624 A. D. with photographs of some of them as they must have appeared in the respective incarnations. The present author does not go into that question here. In the Essays on Immortality edited by B. H. Streeter it is said (on p. 297) that lack of conscious continuity between two incarnations of a soul negatives the doctrine. One may ask: what grounds are there to hold or to prove that the reprobate criminal who will be awarded a judgment of eternal punish-

ment will remember while undergoing hell fires his past life on earth? If one can believe in future eternal punishment for a confirmed sinner without any tangible evidence of memory of the sinful life he lived, why refuse to believe in pre-existence merely on the ground of absence of memory? Vide 'Some Dogmas &c.' p. 130. Further, science holds that matter and energy are indestructible, they are only transformed into other forms. Why should one regard it as absurd if one were to hold that the soul (to which post-existence is granted by Christianity and some other religions) should be held to come into existence in the present life all at once and not be held to have had previous existence but only in a different form? The continuity of the soul in past and future existences is merely a metaphysical question and cannot be affected by the loss of memory. The latter occurs in one life of many years as to numerous happenings and at least in that one life the soul is admittedly one throughout.

Another objection is on the ground of heredity. We often find a strong likeness between parents and children in body and sometimes in mental faculties also. How are we to explain this? One answer may be that by some law not yet discovered the soul that has to undergo rebirth is born to parents suited to his condition. Besides, children are not exactly like their parents, some resemble in several physical features the mother or the father, but not in all and children of the same parents differ among themselves even as regards physical features. As regards mental qualities, children do not very often resemble their parents. What sort of mental equipment was possessed by the parents of such men of genius as Shakespeare, Newton, Ramanujan, Einstein? Karma does not express what a man inherits from his ancestors, but it expresses that which he inherits from himself in some previous state or states of existence.

Another objection is often raised that belief in the doctrine of Karma would make men callous to human misery and suffering and unwilling to help. This also is a perverse idea. From the ancient Vedic times charity and compassion have been inculcated as the duties of all men without distinction. The Ṛgveda (X. 117. 6) sage declares 'that man who cooks food for himself and eats it himself alone simply incurs sin' (kevalāgho bhavati kevalādī). The Bṛ. Up. V. 2. 3 prescribes for all men the three duties viz. self-restraint, charity and compassion. If

a man having the means to help another does not offer help he would be failing in his duty. It is possible that the result of the sufferer's Karma might have been meant to be mitigated by the kindness of helpers.

Another objection is sometimes raised as follows. The population of the earth is growing rapidly. The question is: where do the additional egoes come from (vide Berthelot's work, English tr. p. 127 and J. E. Sanjana's book on the 'Dogma of re-incarnation' p. 81). Several answers are possible. Several species of lower animals have become extinct and the number of wild animals such as the lion is rapidly being reduced. It is possible for one who believes in Karma doctrine to argue that the selves that were masquerading as beasts now appear as human beings, because their Karma that reduced them to the state of beasts has been exhausted.

Some of the Purāṇas declare that a man who is very sinful may reach lower and lower states e. g. the Vāyupurāṇa[2599] (chap. 14 verses 34–37) provides that a very sinful man may become *paśu* (cattle or a beast), then deer, then a bird, then a creeping insect and then a tree or other immobile object. Theosophists and some modern scholars hold that once the human state is reached there is no regression at all. It may be noted that the Kaṭhopaniṣad expressly states (in V. 6–7) that after the death of the body the souls take up birth in other bodies, while some become tree-trunks according to their actions and knowledge. The Ch. Up. V. 10. 7 says 'those whose conduct has been evil will quickly attain an evil birth, the birth of a dog or hog or cāṇḍāla.' Manu (XII. 9) avers that a man is reduced by bodily sins to the stage of a tree-trunk, by sins due to speech to being a bird or a beast and by mental sins to lowest births (of a cāṇḍāla etc.). In verses 62–68 of chapter XII, Manu describes the different births of various animals by the commission of thefts of various articles and in verses 52–59 the births due to the grave sins of brāhmaṇa-murder, drinking liquor, incest. The Yājñavalkya Smṛti (III. 213–215) also contains provisions similar to Manu XII. 53–59. The Yogasūtra II. 13 also suggests that the retribution for various sins results in being

---

2599. कर्मणा मनसा वाचा यदभीक्ष्णं निषेव्यते । तत्प्रसह्य हरेत्पापं तस्मात्सुकृतमाचरेत् ॥ यादृग्जातानि पापानि पूर्वं कर्माणि देहिनः । संसारं तामसं तादृक् षड्विधं प्रतिपद्यते ॥ मानुष्यं पशुभावं च पशुभावान्मृगो भवेत् । मृगत्वात्पक्षिभावं तु तस्माच्चैव सरीसृपः ॥ सरीसृपत्वाद्गच्छेद्धि स्थावरत्वं न संशयः। वायुपु. 14. 34–37.

born in low births or dying prematurely or experiencing misery and suffering.

It is rather difficult to regard all this body of authority as mere arthavādas (not meant to be taken seriously but intended only to frighten intending sinners). Dr. Radhakrishnan (in 'An idealist view of life' ed. of 1932) suggests that it is possible that rebirth in animal form is a figure of speech for rebirth as human beings with animal or beastly qualities (page 292).

SECTION X

The fundamental conceptions and characteristics of Hindu (Bhāratīya) culture and civilization from the Vedic times to about 1800 A. D. and future trends.

CHAPTER XXXVI

Fundamental and leading characteristics of Hindu culture and civilization

It is necessary to gather together the threads scattered over six thousand pages of the History of Dharmaśāstra and to emphasize the fundamental and leading characteristics and conceptions of Hindu culture and civilization.

The word Hindu (in the form 'Hidu') appears to have been applied by the Persian[2600] Emperors Darius (522–486 B. C.) and Xerxes (486–465 B. C.) to the territory and people to the west and to the east of the great river Sindhu, while the Greeks referred to the people in the same region as 'Indoi', from which comes the word 'Indian'. Herodotus in his History (Loeb series) states that the Thracians were the biggest nation in the world next to the Indians (Book 5 para 3, vol. III p. 5) and that the Indians constituted the 20th province of the Persian Empire and paid 360 talents of gold dust as tribute. The word 'Sindhu' occurs more than two hundred times in the Ṛgveda alone in the singular as well as in the plural. The words 'Sindhavaḥ' and 'Sapta Sindhūn' occur more frequently than Sindhu in the singular. Indra is often described as having let loose the seven Sindhus for flowing (Ṛg. I. 32.12, II. 12.12, IV. 28.1, VIII. 96.1, X. 43.3). In such passages what is meant is the great river Sindhu and its tributaries (or possibly its seven mouths).

2600. Vide the Naqkh-i-Rustam Inscription of Dāraya-ush (Darius) and the Persepolis Inscription of Kshayārsha (Xerxes) in 'Select Inscriptions' edited by Dr. D. C. Sircar, No. 4 p. 10 and No. 5 p. 12. Sanskrit 'sa' is changed to 'ha' even now in some parts of our country. The ancient Parsi scripture Vendidad (S.B.E. Vol IV p. 2) mentions sixteen lands out of which nine can be identified, the 15th being Hapta Hindu (Sapta Sindhu).

Many passages of the Ṛgveda where the singular is employed refer to the river Sindhu alone (as in Ṛg. II. 15.6, IV. 30.12, V. 4.9 &c). In Ṛg. II. 15.6 it is said that Indra made Sindhu flow northwards. This would obviously refer to the first part of the river flowing northward from the Himālayas. Pāṇini uses the word 'Sindhu' as the name of a country in IV. 3.93 ('Saindhava' means one who or whose ancestors lived in the Sindhu country). For the fluctuating limits of Āryāvarta, vide H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 11-16 and p. 1525, note 2483 above, where Ṛg. passages about Bharatas are set out and it is shown that the Purāṇas speak of Bharata-varṣa as of the same extent as that of modern India and the name is said to have been due to Bharata, son of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā. Bharatavarṣa occurs in the Hathigumpha Inscription of Khāravela (line 10 on p. 79) which cannot be assigned to a date later than the 1st century[2601] B. C. It has been shown above (p. 1016 n. 1649) that Aśoka in one of his edicts refers to his kingdom as Jambudvīpa. Even in these days in the rather long *saṅkalpa* (declaration) at the beginning of a religious act in Mahārāṣṭra, occur the words 'Jambudvīpe Bharatavarṣe Bauddhāvatāre Godāvaryā dakṣiṇe tīre' &c. Therefore, the proper word to be used by us for our country should be Bharatavarṣa. It may be said that our culture and civilization had throughout the past ages a geographical background. The Constitution of India has recognized this in its very first Article which runs 'India, that is Bharat, shall be a union of States'. In view of the fact, however, that the words 'Hindu' and 'Indian' have been employed for centuries by foreign as well as our own writers, this work will employ those words instead of 'Bharatavarṣa'.

The words 'culture' and 'civilization' are used as synonyms by some writers, while some others regard them as quite distinguishable. These two are defined in various ways by scholars. A few definitions are set out here by way of sample.

Dr. Tyler states (in 'Primitive Culture' vol. I p. 1, Murray, London, 1871) 'Culture or civilization is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and

---

2601. Vide E. I. vol. XX pp. 71-89. Scholars differ about the date of this Inscription, Jayaswal holding (*ibid.* p. 77) that it belongs to the first half of the 2nd century B. C., while N. N. Ghosh in J. G. J. R. I. vol. VI pp. 97-106 opines that it belongs to the last quarter of the first century B. C.

any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society'. Matthew Arnold's definition of culture in his lengthy essay on 'Culture and Anarchy' (1869, Preface p. VIII) is rather restricted in scope. He regards culture as a 'pursuit of our total perfection by means of getting to know, on all the matters which concern us, the best which has been thought and said in the world, and through this knowledge turning a stream of fresh and free thought upon our stock notions and habits which we know follow staunchly but mechanically, vainly imagining that there is a virtue in following them staunchly which makes up for the mischief of following them mechanically'. Prof. P. A. Sorokin in 'Social and Cultural Dynamics' (1957, p. 2) defines human culture as 'the sum total of everything which is created or modified by the conscious or unconscious activity of two or more individuals interacting with one another or conditioning one another's behaviour.[2602] Prof. Edgerton in Journal of American Oriental Society in a paper on the 'Dominant ideas in the formation of Indian Culture' (vol. 62 for 1942 pp. 151-156) understands culture as a total way of life viewed as a norm and as such approved or at least tolerated by a people as a whole and by its articulate representatives generally.

Prof. Toynbee in 'Civilizations on trial' (1948) states (p. 223) 'I mean by a civilization the smallest unit of historical study at which one arrives when one tries to understand the history of his own country, U. S. A., say, or U. K.' Prof. Toynbee in his latest work 'Reconsiderations' (vol. XII pp. 76-77, of his Study of History) adopts Bagbey's definition of culture as meaning 'regularities in the behaviour, internal and external,

---

2602. Prof. Sorokin (*ibid.* pp. 24-25) distinguishes two types of integrated cultures, one called ideational and the other sensate. None of the two has, according to him, existed in the purest form. In some cultures the first type prevails, in others the 2nd; while in still others both might mingle in equal proportions and on equal basis. This last he terms 'idealistic type' (which is not to be confused with the ideational type). Dr. G. S. Ghurye's 'Culture and Society' (University of Bombay Publications, 1947) is a very useful book on culture and civilization and considers at length the views of eminent writers like Emerson, Arnold, Morley, Whitehead, Russell, Laski, Wells and others. Prof. Northrop in 'Meeting of East and West' (1946) and Prof. Sorokin in 'Social Philosophies in an age of crisis' (London, 1952) p. 145 hold that the total culture of a nation in the East or West is not a mere heap of numerous phenomena unrelated to each other but rather as grounded in differing philosophical conceptions of the nature of man and of the universe.

of the members of a Society, excluding those regularities which are clearly hereditary in origin' and adds that 'religious practices and institutions and, by implication, also religious beliefs and experiences are certainly a part of culture as thus defined' and mentions religion together with art, technology, social structure as examples of the elements of which culture consists (pp. 84, 95). Prof. Toynbee further says that in his volumes he employed the word 'culture' in two different senses, viz. (1) the comprehensive one in which it is used by Bagby and (2) in an exclusive sense in which the word has been current in contemporary English since the time of Matthew Arnold (*ibidi.* p. 272). As regards the word 'civilization' he remarks (p. 273) that civilization is a hybrid word of modern French coinage and Johnson refused to include it in his dictionary.

Archibald Robertson (in 'Rationalism in theory and practice', London, 1954 p. 62) says "when we use the word 'civilization', we mean a society with enough command over nature to raise it above savagery or barbarism. Civilization primarily means 'civitas' city life, division of labour and consequent surplus production over and above mere animal needs.' Vide Prof. S. Levi's book 'L' Inde et le Monde' p 63 translated in H. Kraemer's 'World cultures and world religions' (London 1960) p. 345 where it is really a definition of Hindu civilization alone.

It is unnecessary to cite further definitions. We may accept any one of these for a working hypothesis. If a distinction is to be made between the two words, one may say that the word 'culture', being neutral in meaning, is the better one to use than the word 'civilization'. The latter word is often employed for an advanced stage of social development and is contrasted with the stage of primitive or barbarian societies. People often speak of primitive culture, but rarely, if at all, of primitive civilization.

During the last 6000 years of human history, several cultures and civilizations rose and fell. Spengler, a militarist and anti-rationalistic author, who does not rely on religion, morality or politics but is a votary of force, examines about thirty civilizations and cultures and propounds the thesis that all of them (except seven or eight) follow a certain common pattern, viz. they are born, grow, decline and die and that once defunct they are not revived. Prof. Toynbee, a Christian (and

not a militarist) in his ' Study of History ' appears to arrive at conclusions not unlike those of Spengler, viz. culture and societies have stages of childhood, maturity, senility and disintegration. On p. 758 of Volume IX of his ' Study of History ' he gives a table for nineteen civilizations with the dates of their Epiphany (manifestation), of their breakdown and the span of growth phase in number of years. He puts down Indic civilization as starting in 1375 B. C. and as breaking down in 725 B. C. and Hindu civilization as beginning in 775 A. D. and its breakdown in 1175 A. D. This is, to say the least, most objectionable.[2603] The distinction between Indic and Hindu civilization is arbitrary and the dates also are so. Why the Hindu civilization is held by him as breaking down in 1175 A. D. is quite unconvincing and what was the nature or name of India's civilization between 725 B. C. and 775 A. D. is not stated by him. On the other hand, the whole metaphor of being born, growing, maturing and disintegrating is held inapplicable to civilizations by other distinguished writers, such as J. G. De Beus in the ' Future of the West ' (London, 1953), who remarks that civilizations are not born and they do not die (p. 60), but are transformed or absorbed. Prof. Sorokin asserts (in 'Social and Cultural Dynamics') that his theory has little in common with the age-old theories of the life cycle of culture and societies with stages of childhood, maturity, senility and decay (p. 627). Leonard Woolf in ' Quack, quack ' mercilessly criticizes Spengler's theories (pp. 139–160). A. L. Kroeber in ' Style and Civilizations ' (New York, 1957) agrees with Prof. Sorokin and disagrees with Spengler and Toynbee and remarks that ' the study of civilizations can hardly become truly scientific or scholarly until it divests itself of emotional concern about crisis, decay, collapse, extinction and doom ' (p. 160).

Among the numerous civilizations and cultures that flourished in the world there are only two (namely, the Indian and the Chinese) that have survived and kept up a continuity of tradition for four thousand years (if not more) in spite of recurrent invasions by foreign hordes like those by Persians,

---

2603. While these pages were passing through the press, I received Prof. Toynbee's ' Reconsiderations ' (Vol. XII of his Study of History) on p. 184 of which he revises his opinion by saying " the maintenance of the brahmans ' monopoly of the religious ministry gives Indian History a continuity throughout the period running from the Aryan invasion to the impact of the West ".

Greeks, Scythians, Huns, Turks and notwithstanding internal conflicts and convulsions.[2604] India absorbed such people and made many Greeks, Śakas and other foreigners adopt the spiritual ideologies of India and found for them a place in the Indian social fabric (as has been and will be shown later). Not only so, India could spread its literature, religion, art and culture, not by invasions or annexations but mostly by peaceful means, viz. teaching, translations of Sanskrit works and persuasion, to Ceylon, Burma, Sumatra, Malaya, Java, Bali, Borneo, China, Tibet, Japan, Mongolia and Corea.[2605] The charming island of Bali is still Hindu with four varṇas, priests being called Pedanda (Pandita), consecrated water for worship being called *Toya* (vide S. Levi's 'Sanskrit texts from Bali' Preface p. XIII G. O. S.), priests still repeating one quarter of Gāyatrī, viz. 'bhargo devasya dhīmahi' (ibid. p. XV) and repeating the yajñopavīta mantra (yajñopavītam paramam etc.) in a corrupt form.

This persistence of Indian culture and civilization for several millennia requires an explanation and a consideration of the fundamental conceptions, values and characteristics of that civilization would enable us to offer a satisfactory one. Indian culture and civilization have a distinct personality and should not and could not be judged by purely European standards.

2604. Vide Prof. Sorokin in 'Social and Cultural Dynamics' p. 697, Dr. Radhakrishnan in 'Religion and Society' (1947) p. 101.

2605. The number of works and papers on the spread of Indian culture in South East Asia, China and what is called 'Further India' or 'Greater India' is very large. A few only out of those that the author has read or consulted are mentioned here : Dr. R.C. Majumdar's 'Ancient Indian Colonies' Vol. I and II; 'Towards Angkor' with 42 illustrations, 1937 and 'Making of Greater India' (London, 1951), both by H. G Quaritch Wales, the latter containing a good Bibliography; 'Śrī Vijaya' by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, 1949, with an appendix of Inscriptions from 683 A. D. to about the 14th century A. D.; 'Civilizations of the East' by Rene Grousset, translated from French by Catherine A. Phillips with 249 illustrations, Vol. II on 'India, Farther India and Malaya' pp. 1-343. For China's debt to India, vide Viśvabhāratī Quarterly, Vol. II pp. 251-261 by Prof. Liang Chi Chao, who states that Hindu scholars that came to China from 8th century A. D. were 24 and Chinese scholars that went to India for study from 265 A. D. to 790 A. D. numbered 187 (the names of 105 out of these being ascertained); vide also 'India and China' by Prof. P. C. Bagchi (Hind Kitabs, 1950), particularly chapters II and III.

Various peoples during past centuries had the conceit that they were far superior to others and had a mission to propagate. When the British empire became so extensive that the 'Sun never set on it', many British imperialists claimed (most hypocritically) that they were carrying on the 'white man's burden'[2605 A] for the benefit and betterment of undeveloped and backward people (when British Imperialism was impoverishing to the utmost the people whom they governed by their colonial policies as will be briefly indicated later on so far as India is concerned). Russia claims that it has the mission to liberate the proletariat from capitalism and to bring about a Paradise on Earth. The Germans under Hitler believed that they belonged to the superior Nordic race and that they would save the world from communism. Such a conceit is not confined to the West. The Chinese believed that they alone were civilized. The Japanese hold that their Emperor is the son of Heaven. In these days some Indians also claim that spirituality existed nowhere except in India. It is quite correct to say that ancient Indian culture and civilization were based on great spiritual values. It would be entirely in the wrong to say that other people had no spirituality. All that we can at most say is that spirituality is more basic to Hinduism and was more diffused among Hindu people than anywhere else. The Manusmṛti provides that only those usages of varṇas and mixed castes that are traditionally prevalent in the country of Brahmāvarta, in Kurukṣetra, in the countries of Matsya, Pañcāla (the country called Doab) and Śūrasena (round about Mathurā) are spoken of as *sadācāra* (II. 17–19) and that all men on the earth should learn their respective duties from brāhmaṇas born in those countries. The Manusmṛti excludes the countries of Madhyadeśa (as defined by it) and Āryāvarta from this provision (II 21–22). Recently, some people appear to rely on the words 'kṛṇvanto viśvam-āryam' occurring in Ṛg. IX. 63. 5–6 and hold that the Veda has put forward the mission of our country as making the whole world *ārya*. But there is hardly any foundation for this conceit. These words occur about the offering of Soma juice (indavaḥ) to Indra. They only mean this-these Soma libations, brown in colour,[2606] (pressed from Soma plant) increase (the

2605 A. Vide Leonard Woolf in 'Barbarians at the Gate' (London, 1939) p. 54 for saying that 'white man's burden' was another name for economic imperialism and also p. 162.

2606. इन्द्रं वर्धन्तो अप्तुरः कृण्वन्तो विश्वमार्यम्। अपघ्नन्तो अराव्णः॥ सुता अनु स्वमा

(*Continued on next page*)

might of) Indra, making the waters to fall (from the sky), destroy hostile men coming to Indra, making all (the whole environment) noble they reach their proper sphere.' There is here no reference whatever to Vedic people making the whole world Ārya. At the most these verses may be interpreted as suggesting that Soma sacrifices to Indra would make the world *Ārya*. Then there is no message in it which modern Indians can give and spread. Soma plant itself became unavailable in Vedic times and substitutes had to be utilized. And hardly any solemn Vedic sacrifices have been performed for centuries in India and very rarely, if at all, Soma sacrifices.

During the last four or five hundred years the Western nations professing Christianity started on a career of conquest, exploitation of undeveloped countries and peoples, colonial empires, use of the discoveries of science for competitive purposes, the amassing of wealth with such ideologies as those expressed in the words 'everybody should be for himself and the devil take the hind-most.' But the devastation and atrocities of the last two world wars and the possibility of the annihilation of the human race or a very large part of it by atomic warfare have now opened the eyes of many thoughtful leaders and people in the West that, if modern civilization is to be saved, they must cultivate regard for spiritual values, love of righteousness and justice, sympathy with the oppressed, and active belief in the brotherhood of man. Though our ancient sages and lawgivers laid great emphasis on spiritul values, a very large majority of our people and so-called leaders have been wanting in the practice of those values for centuries. Instead of merely praising our past glories, the present author would humbly request all educated Indians to be introspective and to ponder over certain questions that are often asked and seek to find the reasons for the loss of our freedom from the 13th century onwards. (1) Why Hindus were generally found inferior to the invaders, Persian, Greek, Scythian, Turk, English, even though Indians far outnumbered and even though most invaders were impressed by the courage and perfect indifference to death on the part of India's soldiers; (2) Why Hindus could not form

---

(*Continued from last page*)

रजोऽप्यर्षन्ति बभ्रवः । इन्द्रं गच्छन्त इन्दवः ॥ ऋ. IX. 63.5–6; compare verse 14 of the same hymn एते धामान्यार्या शुक्रा ऋतस्य धारया । वाजं गोमन्तमक्षरन् ॥ The words धामान्यार्या mean 'the noble dwellings or noble statutes' (of Gods).

a permanent organized State comprising the whole of India for many centuries; (3) why did they fail to take advantage of the splendid natural resources of India to excel in manufactures, commerce and industry. We must enter upon a thoroughgoing and honest inquiry into our past to find our own defects (political and others) that led to our fall for centuries and try to remove those defects as quickly as possible, now that Bhārata has won independence after centuries. There was no political unity of the whole of India till the British began to rule over the whole of India. There were constant wars among Hindu kingdoms and princes. For example, because the Marathas invaded Bengal, the Bengalis hated Marathas and were jubilant over the defeat of the Marathas by the British. We Indians hardly had any deep-seated feeling of all Indians being one people or of nationalism till the 2nd half of the 19th century A. D. This chapter cannot discuss at length the subject of the causes of the downfall of India, politically and in other respects. But a few remarks would not be altogether out of place here.

Hinduism is a combination of many systems and religious ideologies including Vedic ritualism, Vedāntic thought, Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, Shāktism and primeval cults, adapted to the requirements of different types of men and communities with great disparities of intellectual and spiritual attainments. There were only a few matters that would be said to have bound most of the Hindus to each other, viz. the doctrine of Karma and Punarjanma, the unifying influence of the vast and venerated Sanskrit literature that gradually enriched the regional languages, the veneration in which the Vedas were held by all Hindus as the final authority in religious matters, though only a small minority could learn and understand them, the geographical unity of the country from the Himālaya to Cape Comorin emphasized by the Purāṇas and by the pilgrimages to holy places from Mānasa lake and Badrinath to Rāmeśvara. These few elements, however, were not enough to neutralize the causes that militated against effective unity amongst all Hindus. Most of the *ācāryas* and saints laid too much emphasis on otherworldiness and Vedānta and did not lay equal or greater emphasis on or recognize the importance of active and thorough performance of people's duties to themselves, to their families, and to society, the result being that many people, whether fit or unfit, tried to become otherworldly and did not actively pursue worldly values with righteousness. Another cause of disunity

and downfall was the great disparity between the high metaphysical teaching of the whole world being one and the treatment meted out to lower classes and untouchables, owing to ideas of exclusiveness, of purity and pollution by touch &c. The education of the masses was greatly neglected[2607] and the higher classes did not seriously mind who ruled the country as long as their life was not much disturbed. The great patriot and revolutionary Savarkar, hammered on seven fetters by which Hindu society was bound for centuries, viz. untouchability, prohibitions of several kinds viz. sea travel, of mutual dining among the hundreds of castes and subcastes, of intercaste marriages, of Veda study against several castes, prohibition against following certain occupations and prohibition against re-admission to Hinduism of people that were converted to other religious faiths by force, fraud or ignorance.

Our cultural history shows some central features which may be mentioned in one place here. The first is that there has been an unbroken religious tradition from the Vedic times almost to the present day. Vedic mantras are still employed throughout the whole of India in religious rites and ceremonies by all brāhmaṇas and by a large number of the members of castes claiming to be Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas. The Vedic gods are not entirely forgotten. Kindling of Agni is still required at the beginning of all rites; Viṣṇu (though not so frequently praised as Indra, Agni or Varuṇa, yet often enough, is praised in Ṛg.I. 22. 16-21, I. 154. 1-6, I. 155. 1-6, VI. 69. 1-8, both Indra and Viṣṇu are praised in Ṛg. VII. 99. 1-7, Atharvaveda VII. 27. 4-9) and Siva (Rudra of the Ṛgveda, transformed a great deal yet highly praised in Ṛg. II. 1.6, II. 33,9, X. 92.9 where he is spoken of as Śiva) are even now the principal deities worshipped. In the morning and evening Sandhyā worship, brāhmaṇas in many parts of India still repeat respectively verses addressed to Mitra (Ṛg. III. 59) and Varuṇa (Ṛg. I. 25). The second feature is that, India being a vast country (as large as the whole of Europe minus Russia), central authority in political power never existed (except perhaps for a short time under Aśoka). The ideal was that of supreme ruler (*samrāṭ* or *cakravartin*). But, if a king submitted, acknowledged the prowess of the successful conqueror

---

2607. Vide Works of Vivekananda (Mayavati ed. Vol. III. pp. 191–192, 428–29, V. 122, VI. 224). The census of 1951 disclosed that there were fifty-one million untouchables in Bhārata.

and paid some tribute, no samrāṭ troubled himself to look into tho affairs of the kingdoms ruled by petty kings. There could, therefore, be no common front against a foreign invader, no uniformity in laws, customs and practices and there were frequent wars among kings and petty princes. A third feature was that there did not develop a serious clash of cultures, there was tolerance about varying ideologies and beliefs and constant adaptation to create harmony in diversity.

It makes one sad to find that not a single Hindu scholar resembling Alberuni came forward to inquire into the causes of the successful invasions of India by Mahmud of Gazni and later hordes. Intellectuals were mostly engaged at least from the 11th century onwards in composing works of thousands of pages on such topics as Vrata, Dāna, Śrāddha (as the very learned minister Hemādri did) or in mental gymnastics about logic, Vedānta, Poetics and similar subjects and appear to have bestowed little thought on finding means of meeting the onslaught of foreigners or the remedies for removing their own weaknesses and defects. There were also other causes of the downfall of Hindus. Our intellectuals did not or could not pursue and make their own discoveries of science and technology made in the world from the 15th century A. D. Shahaji purchased firearms from foreigners. Neither he, nor his great son Shivaji, the founder of the Maratha empire, started factories for the manufacture of up-to-date firearms and cannon. Similarly, our people did not properly appreciate the role of a powerful navy. If the Hindus or their rulers had possessed a powerful navy they would have been able to nip in the bud the ambitions of the Portuguese, the French and the English.

We must now set out the important characteristics of Hindu culture and civilization.

1. The most striking conception even as early as the Ṛgveda is that there is only one Reality or Essence, in spite of the fact that people speak of it or worship it as Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Agni &c. (Rg. I. 164. 46, VIII. 58. 1, X. 129. 2, q. above on p. 1487). In the Mahābhārata, Purāṇas, in classical Sanskrit Poetry and even in medieval times, when there were various cults and schisms, such as the worship of Viṣṇu or Śiva or Śakti, almost all Hindus had an inner consciousness that God is one though called by various names; vide p. 118 note 306, p. 973 and note 1593 above, and Harivaṁśa (Viṇṇuparva 25. 31), Kumārasambhava VII. 44.

2. From this conception arose the great tolerance that Hinduism at all times showed to freedom of thought and worship, which has been dwelt upon by the present author in H. of Dh. Vol. II p. 388 note 928, Vol. V. pp. 970-71, 1011-1018 (references to Aśoka's edicts and Yāj. I. 343 and numerous instances of Indian kings and donors of one persuasion making gifts to temples and institutions of other cults and persuasions); vide also Gītā 7. 21-22 and 9.23. To hunt down heretics, real or supposed, has been a favourite business of some religions[2608] for centuries. This has been absent from Hinduism. Hindusim is not bound by any fixed creed nor does it rely on a single book[2608] or a prophet as its founder. All that it requires is that man shoud be God-fearing and what matters is not correct beliefs but moral conduct and social behaviour. Hindus do not deny the truth of any religion or reject the validity of another man's religious experience. A verse[2609] quoted below breathes a broad-minded approach to religious beliefs and worship 'May Hari, the Lord of the three worlds, bestow on you the desired reward, whom the Śaivas worship as Śiva, Vedāntins as *brahman*, the Bauddhas as Buddha, the Naiyāykas proficient in the means of knowledge as the Creator, those devoted to Jain teachings as Arhat and Mīmāṁsakas as Yajña'. The great logician Udayana who composed his Lakṣaṇāvali in *śaka* 906 (984 A. D.) breathes in his Nyāyakusumāñjali the same spirit as is contained in the verse translated above. Tolerance is thus of the essence of Hinduism and even an atheist is often met with amusement and not with persecution.

III. Working on the doctrine that there is only one Essence or Godhead, the sages of the Upaniṣads arrived at the

---

2608. For Biblical intolerance one may read Jeremiah 29.8–9, Colossians II. 8, Galatians I. 7–9.

2609. यं शैवाः समुपासते शिव इति ब्रह्मेति वेदान्तिनो
बौद्धा बुद्ध इति प्रमाणपटवः कर्तेति नैयायिकाः ।
अर्हन्नित्यथ जैनशासनरताः कर्मेति मीमांसकाः
सोऽयं वो विदधातु वाञ्छितफलं त्रैलोक्यनाथो हरिः ॥

सुभाषितरत्नभाण्डागार (Nir. ed. of 1935 p. 15 verse 27);

न्यायकुसुमाञ्जलि I. 2 is : स्वर्गापवर्गयोर्मार्गमामनन्ति मनीषिणः । यदुपास्तिमसावत्र परमात्मा निरूप्यते ॥ इह यद्यपि ये कमपि पुरुषार्थमर्थयमानाः शुद्धबुद्धस्वभाव इत्यौपनिषदाः । आदिविद्वान् सिद्ध इति कापिलाः । क्लेशकर्मविपाकाशयैरपरामृष्टो निर्माणकायमधिष्ठाय सम्प्रदायप्रद्योतकोऽनुग्राहकश्चेति पातञ्जलाः । लोकवेदविरुद्धैरपि निर्लेपः स्वतन्त्रश्चेति महापाशुपताः । शिव इति शैवाः । पुरुषोत्तम इति वैष्णवाः । पितामह इति पौराणिकाः । यज्ञपुरुष इति याज्ञिकाः । निरावरण इति दिगम्बराः । उपास्यत्वेन देशित इति मीमांसकाः । यावदुक्तोपपन्न इति नैयायिकाः । लोकव्यवहारसिद्ध इति चार्वाकाः । किंबहुना कारवोऽपि यं विश्वकर्मेत्युपासते ॥.

conclusion that the individual self is non-different from the one Essence, that all manifoldness is only apparent, that even fishermen, slaves, gamblers and the inanimate world are non-different from it. This Vedānta doctrine is one of the most characteristic features of Hinduism and is India's great contribution to the spiritual development of man, though there are sporadic instances of this doctrine having been held by some ancient philosophers in other lands. This idea of one in the many and many in one is the very core or centre of Vedānta. This has been dealt with above (vide pp. 1499-1500 notes 2451-52 and pp. 1509-10). In Europe the study of philosophy is an end in itself. In ancient India this idea of the unity in diversity was made the basis of education and sociology and it was held that the realization of this unity in one's life was the highest freedom (mokṣa).

The Upaniṣadic teaching is a universal doctrine in which all men of good will can meet and combine, in whatever religion they might have been brought up from their childhood. Many illustrations are adduced in the Upaniṣads to bring home non-difference to the inquirer about the Essence. But two are very apt. The Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad (III. 2. 8) declares "just as rivers flowing (towards the ocean) become merged in the ocean after giving up their names and forms, so the man who realizes (knows), being free from name and form, attains the divine Person that is higher than the highest ". The Praśnopaniṣad has (VI.5) the same illustration in prose. The Kaṭhopaniṣad IV. 15 states 'just as pure water poured into pure water assumes the same form (appearance), similarly the soul of the sage who has realized (the Essence) becomes the Ātman (Self).' Deussen in his address on 20th February 1893 before the Asiatic Society of Bombay (in J. B. B. R. A. S. No. 18 for 1893 Art 20 pp. 330-340) after quoting the verse of Muṇḍaka III. 2. 8 remarks "It is not the falling of the drops in the infinite ocean, it is the whole ocean returning to that which he really is and has never ceased to be, to his own all-pervading eternal almighty nature " and concludes (p. 340) " Vedānta in its unfalsified form is the strongest support for morality, is the greatest consolation in the sufferings of life and death; Indians, keep to it. " Vide V. S. II. 3.43, where reference is made to Atharvaveda 'Brahma dāśā brahma dāsā brahmeme kitavā uta ' (occurring in the Paippalāda version as shown by Prof. Durgamohan Bhattacharya in his paper on a

palm-leaf ms. of the Paippalāda-saṁhitā in Adyar Library Bulletin, vol. XXV, parts 1–4).

IV. From very ancient Vedic times one of the fundamental conceptions of our Indian culture has been the idea of three spiritual and religious debts owed by a person to the sages, gods and *pitṛs*, which he paid off by the study of the ancient lore, by sacrifices, and by having a son or sons respectively. This subject has been dealt with at length in the H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 270, 425, 560–61, 676, Vol. III p. 416 and above. p. 1318 note 2168. To these three debts the Mahābhārata added a fourth viz. the debt owed to all men paid off by goodness (vide H. of Dh. Vol. III p. 416 n. 675). Śabara on Jaimini VI. 2.31 explains that this doctrine is not confined to brāhmaṇas but to all members of the three classes, the word 'brāhmaṇa' used in the Tai. S. and other Vedic texts being only illustrative.

V. Another set of values is contained in the conception of *puruṣārthas* (ends or goals of human endeavour) viz. Dharma (right conduct), Artha (economics, politics and civics), Kāma (life of sex, of pleasures and aesthetics), Mokṣa (salvation, release or recovery by the self of its real nature and freedom from the bondage of low desires and aims). Mokṣa is said to be the highest goal (paramapuruṣārtha) and the first three are spoken of as 'trivarga'. The concept of Dharma is a far-reaching one and has been emphasized from very ancient times and refers to the principles which men have to observe in their lives and in social relations. This subject of puruṣārthas and of dharma has been dealt with at some length in H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 2–11 and Vol. III pp. 8–10 and 239–241. Therefore, only a few matters would be briefly emphasized here. It has been shown above on pp. 1–21 how the Ṛgveda had three words viz. *ṛta* (cosmic order), *vrata* (laws or ordinances deemed to be laid down by a god or gods) and *dharma* (religious rites or sacrifices or fixed principles), how gradually *ṛta* receded into the background and 'satya' took its place and Dharma became an all-embracing conception and vrata came to be restricted to sacred vows and rules of conduct. When a teacher was about to take leave of the pupil at the end of the latter's studenthood he placed in his final exhortation (Tai. Up. I. 11) Truth as the first and Dharma as next to it (satyaṁ vada dharmaṁ cara). The Bṛ. Up. I. 4. 14 equates *Satya* with *Dharma*. One of the noblest prayers occurs in the Bṛ. Up. (I. 3. 28) 'from falsehood lead me unto truth, from darkness unto light, from death

unto life eternal'. The same Upaniṣad in V. 2. 3 inculcates on all men the three cardinal virtues of self-restraint (*dama*), charity (*dāna*) and compassion (*dayā*). The Chān. Up. V. 10 quotes a verse 'the thief stealing gold, the drinker of liquor, one who dishonours his guru's bed and the murderer of a brāhmaṇa—these four fall (into hell) and the fifth is one who associates with them.' It would be noticed that this ancient verse contains some of the ten commandments of the Bible. In spite of these (noble) Upaniṣadic teachings of Dharma and morality, Prof. Keith (in 'Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upaniṣads', Vol. II. p. 584, ed. of 1925) makes the pontifical but perverse pronouncement that 'the ethical content of the Upaniṣads is negligible and valueless'. It is not necessary to combat here his views. Most scholars would rather follow Schopenhauer (quoted in S. B. E. Vol. I. p. LXI) and Deussen (quoted above in Vol. II. p. 424) rather than Keith. The concept of Dharma began to occupy the highest position in the times of the Upanisads. The Bṛ. Up. I. 4.14 states 'there is nothing higher than Dharma.' The Tai.[2610] Āraṇyaka avers 'Dharma is the support (or prop) of the whole world'. The Mahābhārata and Manu repeatedly refer to the high value of Dharma. The Mahābhārata claims that everything concerning the four puruṣārthas is contained in it and that what is not contained in it about them would be found in no other work. In Udyogaparva it is stated 'Dharma is so called because of its character as the sustainer of all beings.' Vanaparva and Manu both declare 'Dharma when violated kills the violator, when preserved it preserves man; therefore, Dharma should not be violated lest Dharma might destroy us.' Vyāsa winds up the Mahābhārata with the solemn appeal 'with arms up-raised I here raise a loud cry, but no one listens to me; from Dharma spring wealth and (satisfaction of) all desires, why is Dharma not resorted to? One should not give up Dharma for some desired object, nor through fear nor from greed nor even for the

2610. धर्मो विश्वस्य जगतः प्रतिष्ठा । लोके धर्मिष्ठं प्रजा उपसर्पन्ति । धर्मेण पापमपनुदति धर्मे सर्वं प्रतिष्ठितं तस्माद्धर्मं परमं वदन्ति । तै. आ. X. 63, महानारायणोप॰; धर्मे चार्थे च कामे च मोक्षे च भरतर्षभ । यदिहास्ति तदन्यत्र यन्नेहास्ति न तत्क्वचित् ॥ आदिपर्व 62.53 = स्वर्गारोहणपर्व 5.50; vide also आदि° 62.23; धारणाद्धर्म इत्याहुर्धर्मो धारयते प्रजाः । उद्योग 89.67, 137.9; धर्म एव हतो हन्ति धर्मो रक्षति रक्षितः । तस्माद्धर्मो न हन्तव्यो मा नो धर्मो हतोऽवधीत् ॥ मनु VIII.15. वनपर्व 313.128 is the same, except that the third pāda is तस्माद्धर्मं न त्यजामि; ऊर्ध्वबाहुर्विरौम्येष न च कश्चिच्छृणोति माम् । धर्मादर्थश्च कामश्च स किमर्थं न सेव्यते ॥ न जातु कामान्न भयान्न लोभाद्धर्मं जह्याज्जीवितस्यापि हेतोः । नित्यो धर्मः सुखदुःखे त्वनित्ये जीवो नित्यो हेतुरस्य त्वनित्यः ॥ स्वर्गारोहणपर्व 5, 62-63.

sake of life itself. Dharma is eternal, pleasure and pain are impermanent, the individual self is eternal, but the conditions (under which self works) are impermanent.' The Mahābhārata passages quoted in n. 18 p. 8 of H. of Dh. Vol. II say 'the three (Dharma, Artha, Kāma) are meant for all men, that Dharma is the best of the three, that Artha is middling and Kāma is the lowest and that if there be conflict then Dharma must be followed and the other two abandoned.' This shows that Artha and Kāma were made subservient to Dharma (the ethical code) and all three were subservient to the spiritual goal. Our Śāstras do not at all prescribe asceticism for all, but they recognized a scale of values. The Manusmṛti (IV. 3 and 15) provides 'one should accumulate wealth for securing only his needs by actions proper for his station (varṇa &c) and without harm to his body. One should not desire to acquire wealth by excessive attachment nor by actions condemned by Śāstra nor when he has already enough wealth nor from any kind of person (a sinner or like), even when he is in straightened circumstances.' Āp. Dh. S. (II. 8. 20 22-23) declares that man should enjoy all such pleasures as are not against Dharma; by doing so he secures both worlds (this life and life in the next world). Gautama Dharmasūtra[2611] IX. 46-47 and Yāj. I. 115 practically say the same thing. In the Bhagavadgītā (VII. 11) Kṛṣṇa identifies himself with Kāma that is not in conflict with Dharma. The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya no doubt says (I. 7) that 'Artha is the chief among the three puruṣārthas', but he also provides that one should enjoy a life of pleasures in such a way as not to conflict with Dharma and Artha, that one should not lead a life devoid of pleasures altogether. The Anuśāsanaparva (chap. III. 18-19) states that Dharma, Artha and Kāma are the three prizes (fruits) of human life, these three should be striven for but in such a way as not to coflict with Dharma'. The Manusmṛti (V. 56) declares that eating flesh, drinking intoxicants and sexual intercourse are not sinful in themselves; all beings are naturally inclined to these; but abstention (from these) leads to great rewards (and therefore Śāstra emphasizes abstention)'. The Rāmāyaṇa (Araṇyakāṇḍa 9.30) contains a statement similar to Svargārohaṇaparva 5. 62.

2611. न पूर्वाह्णमध्यन्दिनापराह्णानफलान् कुर्याद्यथाशक्ति धर्मार्थकामेभ्यः। तेषु तु धर्मोत्तरः स्यात्। गौ. ध. सू. IX. 46–47; धर्मार्थकामान् स्वे काले यथाशक्ति न हापयेत्॥ या. I.115; मिताक्षरा comments 'धर्मार्थकामान् स्वोचितकाले यथाशक्ति न परित्यजेत्। यथासम्भवं सेवेतेत्यर्थः।'; धर्मश्चार्थश्च कामश्च त्रितयं जीविते फलम्। एतत् त्रयमवाप्तव्यमधर्मपरिवर्जितम्॥ अनुशासनपर्व chap. 111. 18–19, ब्रह्मपुराण 217. 11.

When reforms are suggested in these days, conservative people put forward the plea that ours is 'sanātana-dharma'[2612] and so no changes should be introduced. But the words 'sanātana dharma' do not mean that Dharma always stands still or is immutable; all that those words mean is that our culture is very ancient and has a long tradition behind it but they do not mean that Dharma permits no change. As a matter of fact fundamental changes in conceptions, beliefs and practices have been made from ancient times to the medieval times by means of various devices. Attention may be drawn to a few. Veda was all in all in very ancient times but in the Upaniṣads this was changed, the Muṇḍaka I. 1. 5 designating the four Vedas as inferior knowledge (aparā vidyā) and the knowledge of the immutable *brahman* as the higher vidyā; in the Chān. Up. VII. 1.4, the four Vedas and several other branches of knowledge are called by Sanatkumāra (whom Nārada approached for instruction) mere name (*nāma*). Yajñas were the most important religious practice in the early Vedic period, but the Muṇḍaka Up. I. 2. 7 designates them as leaky boats and regards those who hold them as the best thing to be fools. Vide above pp. 1265–72 about changes in the views on anuloma marriages, on the topic of whose food may be partaken even by a brāhmaṇa, the abrogation of many Vedic practices by the doctrine of Kalivarjya (matters forbidden in Kali age) &c. Manu, Yāj., Viṣṇudharmasūtra, Viṣṇu and other purāṇas expressly provide that one should not observe but give up what was once Dharma, if it has come to be hateful to the people and if it would end in unhappiness (vide p. 1270 n. 2071 above). The Śāntiparva[2613] expressly states that what was *adharma* (in one age) may become dharma in another

---

2612. One of the earliest occurrences of the word सनातनधर्म is found in the Khanapur plates of Mādhavavarman (in E. I. Vol. 27, p. 312) edited by Dr. V. V. Mirashi, who assigns it to about the 6th century A. D., in the description of the donee as 'यजनयाजनाध्ययनाध्यापनदानप्रतिग्रहाया (य?) श्रुतिस्मृतिविहितसनातनधर्मकर्मनिरताय etc.'; The land granted was in Returaka (modern Reṭrem in the Satara District of the Mahārāṣṭra State). Another early reference to the phrase सनातनधर्म is in ब्रह्माण्डपुराण II. 33. 37–38 अद्रोहश्चाप्यलोभश्च तपो भूतदया दमः। ब्रह्मचर्यं तथा सत्यमनुक्रोशः क्षमा धृतिः। सनातनस्य धर्मस्य मूलमेतदुदाहृतम्॥. The worde 'सनातनधर्म' are used in the sense of ancient practice no longer prevalent in Ādiparva 122.18 (Ch. ed.), and in the sense of 'duty recognised long ago' in रामायण, अयोध्याकाण्ड 19.26, 21. 49 etc.

2613. भवत्यधर्मो धर्मो हि धर्माधर्मावुभावपि। कारणाद्देशकालस्य देशकालः स तादृशः॥ शान्ति 78. 32.

and that dharma and adharma are both subject to the limitations of country and time. Kāma also was not neglected, as the Kāmasūtra (particularly its chapter on 'nāgaraka-vṛtta' I. 4) will show. The extensive Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata (containing about 5000 verses) is a witness to the aesthetic enjoyment of dance, music and drama in ancient India by thousands of ordinary men and women.

Hindu thought on the three goals of human life came to this 'do your duty, do not fall into temptations, perform duties for their own sake (Gītā II. 47, III. 19), do unto others as you would be done by (Gītā VI. 32, Anuśāsanaparva 113. 8–9, Śānti 259. 20. = Cr. ed. 251. 19), earn wealth but without conflict with dharma and without injury to others and lead a chaste sexual life and enjoy aesthetic pleasures. These summarise the teachings underlying the conceptions of the three puruṣārthas. There was hardly any real pessimism[2614] in the principal Dharmaśāstra works except perhaps here and there in the Mahābhārata. They consider life to be worth living, provided all actions are informed by the dictates of Dharma. Manu (XII. 88-89) provides that Karma (conduct or actions) prescribed by the Veda is of two kinds, viz. *pravṛtta* and *nivṛtta*, the former leading to happiness in this world and to *svarga*, and the latter to niḥśreyasa (mokṣa) and requiring complete absence of all hankerings preceded by realization of *brahma*. The Anuśāsanaparva (chap. 146. 76-80) divides Dharma into pravṛttilakṣaṇa (characterized by persistent activity) and nivṛttilakṣaṇa (characterised by abstention from worldly activities and desires), which latter is to be followed for mokṣa and lays down certain practical and salutary rules viz. one should constantly make gifts according to one's ability, constantly offer sacrifices and perform rites to secure one's prosperity. One should collect wealth following what is right and such wealth obtained righteously should be divided into three parts; one should secure both dharma and artha with one-third of the wealth acquired, one-third should be spent on Kāma (i. e. chaste sexual life and enjoyment of other pleasures not in conflict with dharma) and one-third he should increase. Manu (VII. 99 and 101) prescribes similar rules for the king. The same parvan (Anuśāsana chap. 144. 10–25

2614. The Bible was very pessimistic, both Christ and Saint Paul regard the world as evil or at least spoiled. Christ calls upon people not to resist evil (vide Hobhouse 'Morals in evolution' Vol. II. p. 152).

and 31–39) dwells at length upon those actions that lead men to heaven (the phrase 'te narāḥ svarga-gāminaḥ' is repeated in each verse). These provisions are meant for all ordinary people. The Rāmāyaṇa [2615] quotes a popular verse that man is not condemned to never-ending misery but joy comes to a man even after a hundred years if he be alive.

The 4th Puruṣārtha Mokṣa can be obtained only by a few. It is not a bow which every man or any man can make strung. It was a very difficult path like a razor's edge (Kaṭha Up. III. 14), far more difficult than the path of devotion to a Personal God (Bhagavadgītā XII. 5). The Upaniṣadic doctrine of liberation comes to this that man's nature is really divine, that it is possible for a human being to know and become actually identified with the Godhead, that this should be the ultimate goal of man's life, that this can be achieved by one's own efforts, but the way to achieve this goal is most difficult and requires the aspirant to give up egotism, selfishness and worldly attachments. Besides, there is another difficulty. The conceptions about mokṣa differ in the different schools of thought like Nyāya Sāṅkhya, Vedānta. Even in the Vedānta the conception about Mokṣa on the part of the different ācāryas differs. Some declared that there were four stages in Mukti viz. *Sālokya* (place in Lord's world), *Sāmīpya* (proximity), *Sārūpya* (attaining same form as God) and *Sāyujya* (absorption). [2616] These matters cannot be gone into here.

2615. कल्याणी बत गाथेयं लौकिकी प्रतिभाति मे ।
एति जीवन्तमानन्दो नरं वर्षशतादपि ॥
रामायण सुन्दरकाण्ड 34.6, (M L. J. ed.)

The महाभाष्य quotes the third पाद 'एति जीवन्तमानन्दः' in two places, viz. on पा. I. 3.12 and III. 1.67 under वार्तिक 5, Kielhorn's edition, Vol, I. p. 277 and Vol. II. p. 59.

2616. The तै. सं. V. 7.5.7 has : एतासामेव देवतानां सायुज्यतां गच्छति. But this is entirely different from the idea of मोक्ष. The words सायुज्य, सारूप्य and सलोकता occur in ऐ. ब्रा. II. 24; सायुज्य and सलोकता occur in बृह. उ. I. 3. 22, सलोकता, सार्ष्टिता (same happiness) and सायुज्य occur in छा. उ. II. 20. 2. The सूतसंहिता (मुक्तिखण्ड chap. 3. 28) speaks of the same four stages of मोक्ष. सायुज्य is derived from सयुज् (yoked or joined together). The words सयुजः वाजान् (horses yoked together) occur in Ṛg. III. 30. 11 and सयुजा (meaning सयुजौ) occurs in Ṛg. I. 164.20. The पुरुषार्थसुधानिधि of सायण (Madras Govt. Oriental Mss. Series, ed. by T. Chandrasekharan, 1955) in its मोक्षस्कन्ध states : मुक्तिर्नानाविधा प्रोक्ता सायुज्यादिप्रभेदतः । तत्र सायुज्यरूपाया मुक्तेः साक्षात्तु कारणम् । सम्यग्ज्ञानं न कर्मोक्तं नानयोश्च समुच्चयः । कर्मणैव हि सिध्यन्ति पुंसामन्याश्च मुक्तयः ॥ (chap. 11 Verses 2–3).

Dharma is divided into different classes from different standpoints. One classification is into *śrauta* (based on the Vedas) and *Smārta* (based on Smṛtis). There was another and a more comprehensive classification of Dharma into six classes viz. varṇadharma (duties and rights of varṇas), āśramadharma (rules about the āśramas), varṇāśramadharma (rules enjoined because the person belongs to a certain class and was also in a certain āśrama (e. g. the rule that a brāhmaṇa brahmacārī should carry a staff of *palāśa* tree), guṇadharma (rules for one who holds or occupies a certain position, as in the case of a king), naimittikadharma (rules that have to be observed only on certain occasions such as bath on an eclipse, expiation for a lapse and lastly sāmānyadharma (duties common to all (such as those described in pp. 10-11 of the H. of Dh. Vol. II). This leads on to the next important characteristic of Hindu culture and society, viz. varṇas and castes.

VI. *Varṇa and caste.* The subject of the origin of varṇa classification, the caste system and the duties, privileges and disabilities of the four varṇas have been dealt with at length in the History of Dharmaśāstra Vol. II. pp. 19–164. It has been shown that the word 'varṇa' (colour) has been applied to *Āryas* and *dāsas* in the Ṛgveda, that these two (āryas and dāsas) were opposite camps, that brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas are mentioned in the Ṛgveda, but the word varṇa has not been expressly connected with them. The words Vaiśya and Śūdra do not occur in the Ṛgveda except in the Puruṣasūkta (Ṛg. X. 90. 12) but even in that hymn the word 'varṇa' is not employed with reference to them. That hymn is held to be comparatively a late one by most modern scholars. It may be conceded that at the time when the Puruṣasūkta was composed the community was divided into four groups viz brāhmaṇas (thinkers, learned men, priests) kṣatriyas (rulers and warriors), vaiśyas (common people following agriculture and crafts) and śūdras (those that did menial work). Such a division of people into four groups is not unnatural and is found in many countries even now. In England there are aristocratic families, there is the middle class and the workers in factories &c. They are not necessarily based on birth alone, though largely so based. It has been shown above (p. 1265) that intermarriages between brāhmaṇas and the other varṇas were allowed up to the time of the Yājñavalkya Smṛti which expresses its dissent from its predecessors

and prohibits a person of the three upper classes from marrying a śūdra woman. There is no evidence to show that intermarriage or interdining among the four varṇas was prohibited in the Vedic age. In the Vāj. S. 30. 6–13, Kāṭhaka S. XVII. 13, Tai. Br. III. 4. 2–3 numerous artisans and craftsmen such as takṣan, rathakāra, kulāla, karmāra, niṣāda, sūta and others are mentioned but it is extremely doubtful whether they had become petrified castes at the period of these works. Rathakāra and karmāra and sūta are mentioned in Atharvaveda III. 5. 6–7. It is probable that by the time of the Chān. Up. V. 10. 7 Cāṇḍālas had become untouchables (like dogs and hogs) and Paulkasa seems to be equated with Cāṇḍāla in Bṛ. Up. IV.3.22. Even in the times of Yājñavalkya and Parāśara (2nd to 6th century A. D.) a brāhmaṇa was permitted to take food at the house of such śūdras as his *dāsa*, cowherd, barber, a tenant of his land on the rent of half share of crops (vide above p. 1266). The varṇas were only four, there was no fifth varṇa (Manu X. 4 and Anuśāsanaparva, chap. 48. 30), though in modern times untouchables are often spoken of as *pañcamas* (against Smṛti usage). The word *jāti* in the sense of caste hardly ever occurs in Vedic literature but it occurs in the Nirukta (XII. 13) and in Pāṇini (V. 4. 9), who explains 'brāhmaṇajātīya' as meaning one who is a brāhmaṇa by caste'. Sometimes, Jāti and Varṇa are differentiated in Smṛtis (Yāj. II. 69, 260), but from ancient times the word *Jāti* is confounded with the word *Varṇa*. Manu (X. 31) uses the word Varṇa in the sense of mixed castes; conversely, the word Jāti is employed in the sense of 'Varṇa' in Manu (VIII. 177, IX. 85-86, X. 41).

A sort of caste system existed in several countries such as Persia, Rome and Japan, but it disappeared and had never attained the complexity of the Indian caste system.

There are now several thousand castes and sub-castes in India. How they arose is, according to the present author, an insoluble problem. Sherring in 'Hindu Tribes and Castes' (1881, vol. III. p. 231) held that caste was an invention (of the brāhmaṇas). How such a huge system could be invented and imposed upon millions of people by a small minority without physical or political power never occurred to the prejudiced Christian missionary of the third quarter of the 19th century.

It is well-known that at least from the 6th century B. C.

onwards India was being invaded by Persians, Kāmbojas,[2617] Greeks, Scythians (generally held to be the same as Śakas), and people like Pāradas, Pahlavas, Cīnas, Kirātas, Daradas (Dards) and Khaśas emigrated into India. Manu (X. 43–44), after mentioning these and Paundrakas, Odras (Orissa), Dravidas, asserts that these were originally Kṣatriyas but had become Śūdras because the sacraments like Upanayana had ceased among them and because they lost contact with brāhmaṇas. Manu X. 45 shows that in his day there were mixed castes that spoke mleccha tongues and Arya languages but were treated as dasyus (śūdras). Gautama-dharmasūtra (IV. 14–17), Manu X. 5–40, Yāj. I. 91–95 and many other works dilate upon the rise of mixed castes from the marriages or unions of men and women of different varṇas and declare how further castes and sub-castes arise from the marriages and unions of men and women belonging to different classes and castes. This was called *Varṇasaṅkara* or simply *saṅkara*, about which Arjuna expressed concern (Gītā I. 41-42) and against which the Bhagavad-gītā (III. 24-25) inveighs bitterly. It was stated by Gautama (Dh. S. VIII. 3) that the prosperity (of the castes and sub-castes), protection and the non-mixture (of varṇas) depend on the king and learned brāhmaṇas. The Nasik Inscription of king Siri Pulumāyi (E. I. Vol. VIII. p. 60 about 130 A. D.) extols the king as having prevented the intermingling of varnas (Varṇasankara).

The mixture of castes (varnasaṅkara)[2618] had gone so far even in the early ages that in the Vanaparva (180. 31–33) Yudhiṣṭhira is made to say that 'It is difficult to ascertain the

---

2617. Atri-smṛti VII. 2 (in prose, Ānan. collection) mentions some of these foreign tribes and peoples. Vide Anuśāsanaparva 33. 21–23 (*Śakā yavana-kāmbojāḥ...kṣatriyajātayaḥ । vṛṣalatvam parigatā brāhmaṇānām adarśanāt &c.*) and Anuśāsana 35. 17–18 also. Śaka and Yavana are included among Śūdras by the Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini II. 4. 10 (q. in H. of Dh. Vol. II. p. 92. n. 200). Aśoka in his Rock Edicts V. and XIII refers to Yonas, Yonarāja and Kāmbojas as people on the borders of his empire.

A. M. T. Jackson says in 'Indian Antiquary' for 1910 p. 77 'the attractive power of Hindu civilization which has enabled it to assimilate and absorb into itself every foreign invader except the Moslem and European...India civilized the nomads of Central Asia, so that wild Turkman tribes have been transformed into some of the most famous Rajput royal races.'

2618. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 59–61 on Varṇasaṅkara.

caste of a person on account of the confusing mixture of *Varṇas*; all men raise progeny from all sorts of women; therefore, those who are wise regard character as the principal and desirable matter' (q. in H. of Dh. vol. II. p. 61 n. 149). The original scheme of varṇas was natural and based on the work that men put in for the community as a whole. It was not based on birth. The ideas underlying the original varṇa system made the nearest approach towards a society in which there was no attempt to secure a competitive equality but in which the interest of all groups were regarded as identical. In Vedic times there were only classes and not castes in the modern sense. Even in the smṛtis when many castes had arisen the greatest emphasis was laid on duties rather than on privileges and on high moral character and the value of the effort made by a man. It is therefore stated in the Gītā (IV. 13) that the system of four varṇas was created on the basis of quality (or on the basis of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*) and actions and (in XVIII. 42–44) it specifies the qualities and actions required in the four varṇas as an ideal, viz. serenity of mind, self-control, austerity, purity, forbearance, straightforwardness, wisdom (spiritual knowledge), knowledge (of all kinds), faith (in God)-these are the natural actions (duties) for a brāhmaṇa; bravery, fury, energy, steadiness, capability, not running away in battle, charity and rulership-these are duties of a kṣatriya; agriculture, keeping herds of cows (and cattle), trade and commerce–these are the natural duties of the Vaiśya; work of the nature of service is the natural duty of the Śūdra. These words of Gītā cannot be used for supporting the present scheme of thousands of castes and sub-castes of water-tight character. If birth had been regarded as the sole or principal basis, the words in the Gītā[2619]

2619. It is remarkable that the late Lokamānya Tilak advocated about four months before his death (in the issue of the 'Kesari' of 16th March 1920) that anyone who spent his life in Indian freedom struggle must be treated as a brāhmaṇa to whatever caste or sub-caste he might have belonged by birth, that caste should not be treated as a matter of birth but that we must begin to treat it as dependent on qualities and actions and he relies on our śāstras and quotes in support a Pali verse from the Suttanipāta: न जच्चा वसलो होति न जच्चा होति ब्राह्मणो । कम्मणा वसलो होति कम्मणा होति ब्राह्मणो ॥ 'a man does not become a Vṛṣala, that is, Śūdra by caste (or birth) nor does he become a brāhmaṇa by birth; a man becomes a vṛṣala or a brāhmāṇa by his actions' (compare Mahāvagga, vāseṭṭhasutta, verse 57 in SBE Vol. X part 2 p. 115).

(*Continued on next page*)

(IV. 13) should have been, ' Jāti-karmavibhāgaśaḥ ' (' or janma--karma') and not ' Guṇakarma '. It would be noticed that out of the nine *Karmāṇi* specified as natural to brāhmaṇas most are moral and spiritual and no emphasis is laid on the element of birth. At the time of the Mahābhārata there must have been a great deal of ferment, some revolt and criticism about the petrified caste system. The epic frequently refers to the theme of varnas and jātis. Vide for example, Vanaparva (chapter 180), Virāṭaparva 50. 4–7, Udyoga 23. 26, 40. 25–29, Śānti 188. 10-14, Anusāsana 143. A few passages may be set out here. Śānti 188. 10 says ' there is no (real) distinction between the varṇas, (since) the whole world is of Brahmā, since it was formerly created by Brahmā, and has had the system of varṇas on account of the various actions (of men) '; Śānti (189. 4 and 8) avers ' that man is known as brāhmana in whom are seen truthfulness, generosity, absence of hate, absence of wickedness, shame (restraint for avoiding wrong-doing), compassion and a life of austerity; if these signs are observed in a śūdra and are not found in a brāhmana, then the śūdra is not a śūdra (should

---

(Continued from last page)

There is great misunderstanding about his opposition to those reformers who did not care for or engage in political agitation but spent their energies and time in inveighing against some social evils. He wanted to remove the evil of grinding poverty and political bondage of India due to the colonial policy of Britain for over 150 years and therefore he stressed the point that everyone must join in the fight for freedom and did not like the idea of some very intellectual men spending time and energy in crying themselves hoarse for only social reform. He thought that when India became free from the incubus of foreign rule, many social reforms would be introduced in no time. Events have shown that he was right, and the social reformers who maligned him were wrong. Our Constitution abolished untouchability at one stroke (Article 17), legislation has made a provision that to treat a man as untouchable in public is punishable (vide Act XXII of 1955 sections 3 and 4), legislation has removed all ban against intercaste marriages and several other reforms have been brought about. Vide ' Social Legislation and its role in Social Welfare ' published in 1956 on behalf of the Planning Commission. For Tilak's article, vide ' लोकमान्य टिळकांचे केसरींतील लेख भाग ३, पृष्ठें ४५३-५८ '. British people were cautious and were generally opposed to progressive social reforms in Hindu Society. The High Courts administered Hindu Law as contained in the medieval digests (nibandhas) like the Dāyabhāga, the Mitākṣarā and the Vyavahāramayūkha and not the law found in ancient smṛtis, which allowed anuloma marriages; vide H. of Dh. vol. II pp. 448–452 and ' A Century of Social reform ' by S. Natarajan, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, particularly pp. 126–173.

not be treated as a śūdra) and the brāhmaṇa is not a brāhmaṇa. A similar passage occurs in Vanaparva 216. 14–15 (quoted above in note 1640 pp. 1005–6 and compared to Dhammapada 393, translated on p. 1005). When the wrangles between Vaiṣṇavas and others were at their highest the Bhāgavatapurāṇa (VII. 9. 10) avers that a cāṇḍāla who is a devotee of Viṣṇu is superior to a brāhmaṇa who is not a devotee of Viṣṇū. Apart from the specific qualities required to be possessed by the members of each of the four varṇas, all Dharmaśāstra works attach the highest importance to certain moral qualities and enjoin them on all men. Manu X. 63, Yāj. I. 22, Gaut. Dh. S. VIII. 23–25, Matsya 52. ˀ–10 (quoted above on p. 1023 n. 1652) prescribe for all Varṇas a brief code of morals, such as ahiṁsā, truthfulness, non-stealing (i. e. no wrongful taking of another's property), purity and restraint of the senses. The Mitākṣarā on Yāj. I. 22 explains that the word 'sarveṣām' therein states that these moral qualities if practised are the means of Dharma for all men from brāhmaṇas *to cāṇḍālas.* Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II *pp.* 10–11 *for different* enumerations of dharmas common to all men. The Manusmṛti (I. 1) begins by saying that the great sages requested Manu to expound the dharmas of all varṇas and of the intermediate castes. This (viz. the Dharmas of varṇas, intermediāte castes and āśramas) is the principal topic in most of the smṛtis.

A very high ideal was placed before brāhmaṇas (vide above pp 936–938). They were to study the Veda and its subsidiary lores as a duty (to be discharged), were to perform sacrifices and make gifts also and their proper means of livelihood were only three viz. teaching the Veda and Śāstras, officiating as priests in sacrifices and receiving religious and other gifts. How arduous learning the Veda was will be clear when it is remembered that a brāhmaṇa who was to be regarded as a very learned one had to memorize one Veda at least. Supposing he was a student of the Ṛgveda he had to commit to memory the ten thousand and odd verses of the Ṛgveda, also its *pada-pāṭha*, its krama-pāṭha, the Brāhmaṇa text (generally the Aitareya), the six Vedāṅgas (auxiliary works) viz. the Kalpasūtra (of Āśvalāyana generally), Vyākaraṇa (the Grammar of Pāṇini in about four thousand *sūtras*), the Nirukta (in at least 12 chapters), metrics, Śikṣā (Phonetics) and Jyotiṣa. The first three of these six Vedāṅgas are rather longish treatises and abstruse. These extensive texts were generally committed to memory without understanding the meaning and so entailed very great strain on

the mind and memory. There were thousands of such brāhmaṇas in India up to the beginning of this century, and even now there are still hundreds of such men. They were to teach the Veda without demanding any fee (demanding a fee to teach Veda was and is regarded as sinful even to this day). They were allowed to receive a fee if the pupil or somebody on his behalf paid something at the end of studenthood. Not only did they transmit the Veda free, but there were in the present author's youth in Koṅkaṇa and Mahārāṣṭra many Vaidik brāhmaṇas who gave free board and lodging to several pupils (or arranged to feed them by turns at the houses of brāhmaṇa families in the village or town). All this has now almost stopped owing to rationing during the world wars and present high prices. So teaching hardly brought any regular and substantial amount of money (vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 108-110). As regards officiating as priests, that was a precarious and fitful source of income. Besides, in Ṛg. times at least, the scion of a royal family could be a *purohita* i. e. a priest (vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. p. 109). It should be remembered that all brāhmaṇas were not priests; they could be so if they chose and if they were learned. Further, many learned brāhmaṇas refuse even now to act as priests in śrāddhas for pitṛs (at least for three years after the man's death). Pāṇini (V. 2. 71) provides for the formation of the word 'Brāhmaṇaka' meaning a province or country where 'brāhmaṇas followed the profession of arms' and Kauṭilya (IX. 2) also refers to armies of brāhmaṇās, kṣatriyas &c. The third source specially permitted to brāhmaṇas was the privilege of receiving religious gifts from a worthy or unblemished person (vide H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 110. 11). Brāhmaṇas could follow other occupations in distress, but even then there were great restrictions imposed on them by śāstras even when they took to other means of livelihood (vide H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 118-132).[2620] The ideal set before brāhmaṇas was one of poverty, of plain living and high thinking, of forsaking a very active pursuit of wealth, of insisting on the necessity and high value to themselves and the Aryan society of studying, preserving, propagating and augmenting the ancient literature and culture. Kings, rich persons and even

---

2620. It was, for example, provided by Vasiṣṭha (*II. 27*) and Manu X. 92 that a brāhmaṇa becomes a śūdra by selling milk for three days. In the present author's boyhood some poor brāhmaṇas had begun to sell milk and the result was that they were very much looked down upon by the villagers. There would be the temptation to add water to the milk to gain money.

ordinary men made gifts of lands and houses to learned brāhmaṇas (which were deemed the most meritorious gifts).[2621] The present author saw in his boyhood very learned Vaidika brāhmaṇas themselves ploughing their own lands, while repeating inaudibly the Veda (i. e. revising it, as otherwise it might slip from their memory) and knew a middle class Vaidika brāhmaṇa family that for seven generations had taught Veda to a number of pupils and provided them with free board and lodging; (out of these seven the present author personally knew three generations, the last of whom stopped a few years ago the Vaidika school owing to present high prices of food, decrease in gifts due to the increasing poverty of the people round about and their unconcern for Vedic studies). Even in the times of the early Upaniṣads, the brāhmaṇa's first duty was to learn and teach the Veda and to take all knowledge for his province. Ajātaśatru, king of Kāśī, exclaimed, when the brāhmaṇa Bālāki Gārgya approached him for knowledge of *brahman*, 'this is against the natural usual course that a brāhmaṇa should approach a kṣatriya to learn about brahman' (Bṛ. Up. II. 1. 15). That indicates that many brāhmaṇas must have endeavoured to act up to the old ideal of learning in olden times. They became the custodians of the vast literature that had accumulated and was growing every day and were expected to preserve that literature and propagate it. Though every brāhmaṇa could not have lived up to the high ideals set up for brāhmaṇas, a very large number must have made as near an approach to the ideal as possible It was the greatness of these latter that led to the glorification of the whole class. In most communities there is a group of the *élite*, which represents the ideals of the whole community, its essential tendencies and acts up to the ideals. Learning, great moral and spiritual attainments among individuals are rather elusive and impalpable, while birth in a certain family is a very obvious thing. Most people in ancient and medieval times followed the occupation of their forefathers. The kingly office was highly eulogised by Manu (VIII. 4-8), who propounded the theory that the king represented in his person eight deities (Indra, Agni, Varuṇa, the Sun, the Moon, Kubera, Yama and Vāyu) and that the king was a great divinity in human form. The office of the king also was hereditary.

2621. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II p. 113 n 241 for large gifts to brāhmaṇas, in the early centuries of the Christian era, of villages, cows and marriage expenses.

Except in a few cases the brāhmaṇas were never rulers. It was the kṣatriyas and śūdras that were rulers. Therefore, a generalisation was made that birth in a particular group or family was a more or less sure indication of the possession of certain qualities generally associated with the members of that group or family. The brāhmaṇas were teachers with no salary, officiated as priests when called and were given fees, but there was no assurance of a continuous and certain payment. They had no church organization[2622] (such as Archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons in the Anglican church) and monasteries for monks among Buddhists and in the Christian Church. The brāhmaṇas were not monks but householders who had to maintain a family and bring up children and to make their sons learned and of high moral and spiritual worth. There is no example in the whole world of a small minority of the population of a country, that had no military strength behind it, being revered for at least thirty centuries without any serious challenge not only by the common people but by nobles and kings. What was the basis of the reverence shown to brāhmaṇas as a class for at least three thousand years? They were believed to be religious, moral and spiritual leaders and the possessors and representatives of an idealistic culture ('ideational' in the language of Prof. Sorokin). The secret of the power of and regard for brāhmaṇas had been the fact that as a class they performed well three of their appointed tasks of study, teaching and comparative renunciation (in spite of the failings of some individual brāhmaṇas). The brāhmaṇas had no army to support them and they could not, by devoting themselves to physical sciences, find new sources of income or well-being for themselves or for the whole community.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in his Autobiography (p. 432) pays in passing a tribute to the Brāhmaṇa ideal as follows 'But the West also brings an antidote to the evils of this cut-throat civilization – the principles of socialism, co-operation and service to the community for the common good. This is not so unlike the old Brahmin ideal of service etc.' The ancient Indian culture exalted the mind and soul over the body and hence arose an extra-ordinary development of asceticism.

2622. The income of the See of the Archbishop of Canterbury, it is understood, has been fifteen thousand pounds a year (vide Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. by F. L. Cross, London 1957, p. 232). Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II p. 138 for a sample of the actions of Popes and eulogies of the Nordic race by Spengler and others.

If in modern times the caste system has broken down and has become harmful and unpopular among all people, it may be scrapped and discarded (vide above p. 1270 note 2071 for provisions about this). But such a huge and all-pervading system cannot be destroyed in a short time nor by legislation. What those who desire to destroy altogether the caste system want is not clear. Do they want complete westernization of the whole of India ? To the present author this appears to be not only very difficult but almost impossible. Legislation may help a little, but it cannot eradicate within the foreseeable future the mental attitudes and outlook of millions of people. Cases have been reported where village *kunbis* and craftsmen threatened to beat untouchables that wanted to draw water from a village well in the presence of a magistrate. If this campaign against the whole caste system is carried on with force, there are sure to be widespread riots and disorders and the Independence of the country attained after two centuries of colonial rule may be jeopardized. Two matters must be carefully considered and strenuously worked for. Government must see to it that nationalism, the emotion of being one people, in spite of differences in some respects, must be instilled from childhood and among the masses. For that purpose free and compulsory education for all children on national lines must be achieved as quickly as possible. Merely inveighing against casteism by leaders would not do, when people often suspect them as guilty of other 'isms' (such as nepotism). Universal primary and secondary education, growing number of inter-caste marriages, a growing sense of solidarity as to essentials of culture (though petty differences may exist) would be the first requisites in any scheme of the removal of castes, Besides, very large numbers of self-sacrificing men, of high moral character and devotion to duty would be required for eradicating the evils of the decayed caste system. Another matter also must be very carefully considered. What is going to be substituted in place of the old caste system ? People are afraid that a new caste system of ministers, bureaucrats, captains of industry, men in power and workers is going to be substituted without the saving grace of the ancient caste system.

It should not be forgotten that high spiritual life and mokṣa were not denied to the śūdra. It is true that the Pūrvamīmāṁsā denied to the śūdra the right to study the Veda and to perform Vedic sacrifices (VI. I. 26). But even in those ancient times

one sage, Bādari, advocated that the śūdra could study the Veda and perform Vedic sacrifices (P. M. S. VI. 1. 27). Besides, it should be noted that the śūdra was not at all debarred from a spiritual life and could secure mokṣa by studying the Mahābhārata (which contains thousands of verses on Mokṣa), which Vyāsa compassionately composed for the benefit of women and śūdras and which calls itself (in Ādiparva chap. 62. 23) Dharmaśāstra, Arthaśāstra and Mokṣaśāstra, as declared by the Bhāgavata-purāṇa I. 4. 25. All that was decided was that a śūdra could not secure Mokṣa by the study of Veda. Śaṅkarācārya on V. S. I. 3. 38 points out that śūdras like Vidura (Ādiparva 63. 96–97 and 114, 106. 24-28, Udyogaparva 41. 5) and Dharma-vyādha (Vanaparva 207) possesed knowledge of *brahmavidyā* and that it is impossible to say that they were not able to secure Mokṣa. Vide above pp. 921–22 and note 1468a for the discussion of the relevant passages. It is noteworthy that even in early Vedic times the Rathakāra (a caste not belonging to any of the three higher classes) was allowed to set up Vedic fires and could repeat certain Vedic mantras for that purpose and the Niṣāda (also not belonging to any of the three varṇas, but being a śūdra) was allowed to perform an *iṣṭi* to Rudra with Vedic mantras. Vide pp. 1290–91 (for Rathakāra) and pp. 1295–96 (for Niṣāda) above. These facts show that Vedic sacrifices had penetrated into certain śūdra castes long before the sūtras and smṛtis The Bhāgavatapurāṇa (VII. 9. 10) was prepared to hold that a cāṇḍāla (by birth) if he becomes a devotee of Viṣṇu was superior to a brāhmaṇa who was not such a devotee.

The disappearance of the caste system, when it comes about, will not at all imply the disappearance or destruction of all that for which Hinduism has stood up during several millennia.

We should not be constantly harping on the caste system as the only or most basic cause of our downfall. The Moslems have no caste system and yet most of the Moslem countries in the world have been backward and under the thumb of Western powers. China, Japan and the countries in S. E. Asia had hardly anything like the caste system of our country, but the first two about a hundred years ago were very backward and many of the countries in S. E. Asia were within the Colonial Empire of Holland, a small country the population of which is even now only about eleven millions. Since 1818 when the British acquired the Deccan, for about 130 years what little

royal power remained in India was distributed among about 600 princely States ruled by kṣatriyas and others and hardly a dozen brāhmaṇa States existed among those 600. What little trade and commerce existed or was allowed by the British to Indians was in the hands of Parsis, Bhatias, Banias, Marvadis, Jains and Lingayats and the brāhmaṇas had very little share in trade and commerce. It was the brāhmaṇa politicians like Tilak that insisted on *Swadeshi*. Agriculture, money lending and Zamindari were mostly in the hands of non-brāhmaṇas except in Bengal and contiguous territories where the Zamindari system supported by Lord Cornwallis prevailed. Our downfall for centuries was due to lack of certain virtues and idealogies among all our people, high or low. Let us, therefore, all Indians, stop blaming the caste system for our downfall and try to eradicate it or lessen its evils and cultivate virtues like duty for duty's sake, high endeavour, high moral character, nationalism, freedom and justice.

VI. *Āśramas* : Another important characteristic of our culture is the system of Āśramas, which have been in existence for certainly several centuries before the Christian era. The word Āśrama does not occur in the Vedic Saṁhitās or Brāhmaṇas. In Śv. Up. VI. 21 occurs the word 'atyāśramibhyaḥ' (to the best of ascetics) which indicates that the word 'āśrama' had then been known. A generic word comprehending several matters is coined long after the several words for the component parts have been current for centuries. The word śrāddha does not occur in any ancient Vedic passages, though the Piṇḍapitṛyajña (performed by an *agnihotrin* on each Amāvāsyā), the Mahāpitṛyajña (performed in the cāturmāsya rite Sākamedha) and the Aṣṭakā rites (all of which are rites in honour of pitṛs) were known in early Vedic literature (vide H. of Dh. Vol. IV. pp. 349–50). Similarly, some of the āśramas were certainly known from the times of the Ṛgveda. The Āśramas [2623] long before the time of the sūtra literature at least have been four viz. brahmacarya (stage of studenthood), gārhasthya (householder stage), vānaprasthya (stage of forest hermit) or vaikhānasa (Gaut. III. 2), Sannyāsa (stage of ascetic life) or Mauna or Pārivrājya or Pravrajyā or Bhikṣu (Gaut. III. 2). Āśramas have been dealt with in H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 416–426, brahmacarya in H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 349–382, forest hermit (in pp. 919–929) and sannyāsa in pp.

2623. चत्वार आश्रमा गार्हस्थ्यमाचार्यकुलं मौनं वानप्रस्थ्यमिति । आप. ध. सू. II. 9. 21. 1 quoted by शङ्कराचार्य in भाष्य on V. S. III. 1. 47.

930–975 (of the same volume). The span of human life is said to be one hundred years or winters or autumns from the times of the Ṛgveda (Ṛg. VI. 4. 8; 10. 7, 12. 6, 17. 15, 24. 10 in all these hundred winters), VII. 101. 6, X. 161. 3 and 4 (autumns). As no one could say how long one might live it is not to be supposed that each stage was of 25 years; all that is meant is that a man may, if he lives long, pass through the four stages. The word brahmacārī occurs in Ṛg. X. 109. 9 and Tai. S. VI. 3. 10. 5 and brahmacarya in Tai. S. VI. 3. 10. 5 and Tai. Br. III. 10. 11. In Ṛg. VI. 53. 2 occurs the word 'gṛhapati' (lord of the house) meaning the same thing as gṛhastha. Indra is said to be the friend of munis (in Ṛg. VIII. 17. 14) and yatis are said to have praised Indra (Ṛg. VIII 6. 18). The Kaṭha Up. IV. 15 saying that the self of the *Muni* (knowing the reality) becomes one with the Supreme Self indicates that the reference is to a Sannyāsin who had realized the Supreme Spirit. The Bṛ. Up. IV. 4. 22 saying that the Great Self is the Lord of the universe, that brāhmaṇas seek to know him by study of the Veda, by sacrifices and gifts, by austerities (*tapas*) and by fasting and that, after realizing that Supreme Self the man becomes a muni, that desiring this stage only the wandering (ascetics) leave home (take to that stage). Here those engaged in tapas are placed at an earlier stage than pravrajyā. Therefore, the Ch. Up. II. 23. 1, speaking about three branches of Dharma, should be taken as mentioning the three āśramas and the words 'one who is firmly established in *brahman* obtains immortality' should be taken as referring to the 4th Āśrama. As pointed out in H. of Dh. Vol. II. pp. 928–929 most of the rules laid down for forest hermits are the same as those for the sannyāsin and there was difference between the two in a few matters only. From Bṛ. Up. II. 4. 1 ff. and IV. 5. 2 ff. (where the word *pravrajiṣyan* is used) for *udyāsyan* (in II. 4. 1) it follows that Yājñavalkya became a sannyāsin (or parivrājaka) immediately after leaving the householder's life. Later on in the *Kalivarjya* acts the stage of being a forest hermit is included. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II. p. 420 n. 999 on Chān. Up. II. 23.1. The stage of householder (gṛhastha) was highly praised. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 424–425, 640–41, Vol. V. pp. 1026–27.

The stage of sannyāsa or yati was highly honoured, because it was deemed to lead to mokṣa. The result was that many persons quite unfit to lead the life prescribed for a real sannyāsin only entered the order and possessed all the outward

signs of that stage such as wearing ochre-coloured garments, shaving the head, carrying three staffs and a water jar. They are condemned in the Mahābhārata, Śāntiparva 308. 47 (cr. ed. = 320. 47 Ch. ed.) quoted in H. of Dh. Vol. II p. 936 n 2151b and above p. 1369 n. 2241). Yāj. III. 58 provides that the sannyāsin should be good to all beings, quiescent, have three daṇḍas and a water jar and should enter a village for begging alms. Some interpreted the word *tridaṇḍī* as meaning ' carrying three staffs', while others like Manu XII. 10 and Dakṣa VII. 30 provide that a person is called tridaṇḍī who observes threefold restraint, viz. of speech, mind and body. The sannyāsin was so highly esteemed that for deciding doubtful points of dharma a single ascetic was allowed to do the work of a pariṣad and declare the proper decision (vide H. of Dh. Vol. II p. 969). Similarly, great emphasis was laid on inviting a Yati at a śrāddha dinner (vide H. of Dh. Vol. IV pp. 388, 399). The Bṛhaj-jātaka (chapter 15) deals with the question about the horoscopic indications for different kinds of ascetics being born on the conjunction of four or more powerful planets in the same sign of the zodiac in the horoscope and adds that according as Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, the Moon, Venus, Saturn, or the Sun is the most powerful of the four or more planets in one sign in a horoscope, the person whose nativity it is becomes respectively an ascetic of the types of Bauddha, Ājīvika,[2624] a bhikṣu (i. e. vedic ascetic), Vṛddha (a Kāpālika), a *caraka*, a nirgrantha (a Jain ascetic) or one subsisting on forest produce, fruits, roots &c.[2625] This shows that long before Varāhamihira (6th century A. D.) so many kinds of ascetics flourished or were common in India.

The *varṇa* system classified the whole community and was addressed to people in the mass; the Āśrama theory addresses itself to the individuals in a community and maps out for them

2624. The ājīvikas were an ancient class of monks. They are mentioned in Aśoka's 7th Pillar Edict (E. I. Vol. II. pp. 270, 272) Daśaratha, grandson of Emperor Aśoka, made grants of caves to Ājivika monks. Vide C. I. I. Vol. I. p. 181. The founder of the order was Gośāla, once a disciple of Mahāvīra, who later left him. The Vāyupurāṇa (62.285) refers to them as ' adhārmika '. Vide ' History and the doctrines of the Ājīvikas ' by Prof. A. L. Basham (Luzac and Co. 1951). This is an exhaustive work on the Ājīvikas.

2625. एकस्थैश्चतुरादिभिर्बलयुतैर्जाताः पृथग्वीर्यगैः शाक्याजीविकभिक्षुवृद्धचरका निर्ग्रन्थवन्याशनाः । माहेयज्ञगुरुक्षपाकरसितप्राभाकरीनैः क्रमात् प्रव्रज्या बलिभिः समाः परजितैस्तत्स्वामिभिः प्रच्युतिः ॥ बृहज्जातक 15.1. उत्पल quotes Prākrit verses on the same subject from Vaṅkālakācārya and several Āryās in Sanskrit from Satyācārya, a predecessor of Varāha.

how they should order their lives and what preparations are required for the several goals of human life. Deussen in the 'Philosophy of the Upanisads' (English translation of 1906, p. 397) says about the Āśrama theory that 'the entire history of mankind does not produce much that approaches in grandeur to this thought.'

VII. The doctrine of Karma and Punarjanma (transmigration or metempsychosis).

This is one of the most fundamental doctrines of the Hindu system of religion and philosophy and is unique in its own way, particularly in its long continuity and immense early literature. It has been dealt with above in a separate and extensive chapter (XXXV pp. 1530 ff). It is not, therefore, necessary to say anything more here.

VIII. Another important doctrine is that of *ahiṁsā*. So far as the Upanisads, Mahābhārata, Dharmaśāstras and Purāṇas are concerned the subject of *ahiṁsā* has been dealt with above in pp. 944-947 and in Vol, II. p. 10. A few matters are briefly mentioned here. The words *kratu* and *yajña* occur hundreds of times in the Ṛgveda. The difference sometimes made is this that the word *yajña* is very general (including the five daily religious duties laid down in Manu III. 70), while *kratu* is confined to solemn Vedic sacrifices like Somayāga. Pānini mentions the two separately (IV. 3. 68) and the Gītā IX. 16 (ahaṁ kraturaham yajñaḥ) also does the same. Animals were offered in some of these, though not in all. Gradually it came to be thought even in the Ṛgveda times that worshipping Agni with fuel sticks or with an oblation of cooked food or ghee or with Veda study or obeisances or with a solemn sacrifice is on the same level and the worshipper is rewarded with swift horses (dashing against enemies) and with highest glory and no trouble whether divine or due to men, reaches him (Ṛg. VIII. 19. 5-6). Some Brāhmaṇa texts are couched in the same strain. The Ait.[2626] Br. (VI. 9) remarks 'he who offers a cake performs a sacrifice equal to the offering of all sacrificial animals'. The Tai. Br. provides that the forest sacrificial animals, after a firebrand is carried around them, are let off for the sake of ahiṁsā. Dr. A. Schweitzer in his 'Indian thought and its development' (tr. into English by Mrs. Russell, 1936) tries hard to establish a contrast between the attitude of what he calls 'world and life negation' in Hindu thought and 'world and life affir-

2626. सर्वेषां वा एष पशूनां मेधेन यजते यः पुरोडाशेन यजते। ऐ. ब्रा. VI. 9; पर्यग्निकृतानारण्यानुत्सृजन्त्यहिंसायै। तै. ब्रा. III. 9. 3. 3 (सायण explains स च पर्यग्नि हिंसाराहित्याय सम्पद्यते).

mation' characteristic of Christianity and as a side issue remarks (on p. 80) that 'the ahiṁsā commandment does not arise from a feeling of compassion but from a feeling of keeping a person undefiled'. The learned author ignores several things; firstly,[2627] not a word is said about purity (śauca) in the

---

2627. This is not the place to give a lengthy reply to Dr. Schweitzer's remarks. Dr. Schweitzer's compliment to Christ, Christianity and the West was criticized by Dr. Radhakrishnan in 'Eastern Religion and Western thought' (1939 pp. 76–110) and by Shri D. S. Sharma in 'Renaissance of Hinduism' pp. 618–634. On p. 2 Dr. Schweitzer boldly asserts that world and life affirmation unceasingly urges men to serve their fellows, society, the nation, mankind and indeed all that lives with their utmost will &c. One should like to know the Biblical passages where all this grand thought is explicitly stated. On p. 4 he contradicts himself when he says 'Christianity also brought European thought into relation with world and life negation.' The two great commandments of Jesus are first 'to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul' and the second is 'thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (vide Matthew 22.37 and 39 and Mark 12. 30–31). This is hardly anything like what Schweitzer says about Christianity's world and life affirmation. Not a word is said here about even loving all human beings, much less loving 'all that lives'. The world has had enough of the world and life affirmation of Christianity (or rather of Christian nations or people). Attention is invited to H. of Dh. Vol. II. p. 180, where Westermarck's remarks in his 'Origin and development of the moral ideas' (1912) Vol. I. p. 711 are cited on slavery. The world knows what during the last four or five hundred years the colonial empires of Christian countries like England, France, Holland, Belgium, Portugal and Spain did in India, Africa, S. E. Asia, the Congo and America. On p. VII of his Preface he appears to contradict himself when he disagrees with the view of Schopenhauer and Deussen about Indian thought being completely governed by the ideal of world and life negation and admits the fact that 'world and life affirmation is present at the back of this thought (Indian thought) from the very dawn of its history, and life negation and world and life affirmation constitute its chief characteristic and determine its development'. Both books (Dr. Sweitzer's and Dr. Radhakrishnan's) are reviewed in 'Hibbert Journal' for 1953 pp. 234–241 and 355–365 by O. W. M. Gell who finds both works disappointing, holds that Schweitzer has misunderstood the Hindu ideal of supra-ethical man, that negation and affirmation have not been properly defined by him, that it was only very late in Christian history that the West began to work actively for improvement of social and economic conditions. Social service was not unknown in Ancient India. The very idea of 'pūrta' dharma is social service. Vide above pp. 947-949. The Purāṇas emphasize the importance of work for relieving distressed beings. For example, the Mārkaṇḍeya has the following very noble sentiment (15. 57) 'men would not obtain that happiness in heaven or in the world of Brahmā which arises from giving happiness to distressed men' (न स्वर्गे ब्रह्मलोके वा तत्सुखं प्राप्यते नरैः । यदार्तजन्तुनिर्वाणदानोत्थमिति मे मतिः ॥). Vide also note 6 on pp. 3-4 of H. of Dh. vol. II.

Chāndogya and other passages about ahiṁsā. Secondly, the injunction about not giving pain to any being (in Chān. Up.) is immediately preceded by the words 'having concentrated all his senses on the Self'. That shows that one who knows and has come to realize that all is *brahma* should give no pain to others as all those also are brahma and not on the ground of purity or defilement. Further, in the Mahābhārata and Smṛtis some of which at least are not far removed in time from the Upaniṣads both ahiṁsā and śauca (purity) are separately mentioned along with other duties (dharmas) common to all varṇas. Gaut. (8. 23–24) lays down eight qualities of the soul for every dvija viz. compassion towards all beings, forbearance, freedom from jealousy, freedom from excessive harm (to himself), doing auspicious acts, absence of abjectness (or miserliness), absence of discontent'. The same eight are specified in the Matsyapurāṇa 52. 8–10, Atrismṛti 34–41. Manu V. 46 (= Viṣṇu Dh. S. 51. 69) provides 'he who does not desire to cage or kill or cause pain to living beings, thus desirous of doing good to all, secures highest (or never ending) happiness'. Śauca is external (of the body) and internal (of the mind). Manu V. 106 expressly says that he who is pure as to money matters is really pure and not one who washes himself with sand or water. Vide above pp. 1421-22 notes 2331 and 2333. It is worthy of note that the Śāntiparve (chapter 162. 4-5 = Cr. ed. 156. 4-5) contains an apotheosis of *Satya* as the ancient Dharma and *brahman* itself and then in verses 7-9 Satya is stated to appear in thirteen aspects such as *tyāga* (renunciation of attachment and pleasures), *samatā* (being the same to all), *dama* (restraint of senses), *kṣamā* (forbearance), *hrī* (being ashamed to boast of one's good deeds), *anasūyā* (absence of jealousy), *dayā* (compassion) and so on, *ahiṁsā* being the 13th aspect of Satya.

It was only in Jainism that thoroughgoing ahiṁsā was preached and practised. Buddha had no objection to eating flesh, provided the animal was not killed specially for doing him honour or treating him.

IX. The three paths, viz. Karmamārga, Bhaktimārga and Jñānamārga. These have already been dealt with above in pp. 964-967, 1462. The Bhagavadgītā expounds the further doctrine of what is called niṣkāma-karmayoga, which has been explained above on pp. 966–67. Doing one's duty without hankering for the fruit thereof is worship of God.

X. Adhikāra-bheda

It was recognised in India from very early times that in the matter of religious worship and philosophical doctrines, there are different grades among human beings. All are not competent to grasp and act upon abstruse metaphysical doctrines or to follow higher forms of worship. This has been brought out in several places before. Vide above p. 973 note 1593 and p. 1462. Abstruse metaphysical doctrines are likely to be misunderstood and therefore we find that there is an effort to keep such doctrines secret and frequent warnings are given in the Upaniṣads not to impart the knowledge of *brahman* to all and sundry and to keep it secret. Vide p. 1071–72 and Chān. Up. III. 11. 5 set out above on p. 1460, Śv. Up. VI. 22, Kaṭha Up. III. 17, Bṛ. Up. III. 2. 13 (Yājñavalkya and Ārtabhāga did not discuss *brahman* among people). The word Upaniṣad came to mean 'secret doctrine' (vide Tai. Up. II. 9 and III. 10). This tendency to keep abstruse doctrines secret obtained in other nations in antiquity (vide St. Mark 4. 11, 34–35). The Haṭhayogapradīpikā[2628] has similar provisions (vide p. 1460 above). Many modern writers condemn people that engage in image worship. The reasons advanced for image worship by Indian works are given in note 1593 p. 973 above. The worshipper of an image of Gaṇeśa or Kālī casts the image in water (a river, sea &c.) after a day or more (when the period of the festival is over). So it is not as if he worshipped the wooden or earthen object but he has an emotional idea for the time being that God is enthroned in that object. These common people, if questioned, will say 'God is everywhere, in you, in me and in the wooden image'. The Nṛsiṁhapurāṇa 62. 5 (quoted by Aparārka p. 140 on Yāj. I. 101) says that sages declare that the worship of Hari (God Viṣṇu) may be performed in six ways, viz. in water, in fire, in one's own heart, in the sun's orb, on an altar or in an image.[2629] The Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa appears to have been conscious that image worship came later in Kali age and was not prevalent

---

2628. हठविद्या परं गोप्या योगिना सिद्धिमिच्छता ।
भवेद्वीर्यवती गुप्ता निर्वीर्या तु प्रकाशिता ॥ हठयोगप्र॰ I. 11

2629. अप्स्वग्नौ हृदये सूर्ये स्थण्डिले प्रतिमासु च । षट्स्वेतेषु हरेः सम्यगर्चनं मुनिभिः स्मृतम् ॥ अग्नौ क्रियावतां देवो ... योगिनां हृदये हरिः ॥ नृसिंहपुराण 62. 5–6 (the 2nd quoted in note 1593 above). Vide स्मृतिचन्द्रिका (आह्निक p. 198 ed. by Mr. Gharpure) which quotes verses from the Smṛtis of Hārīta and Marīci to the same effect. Vide विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराण III. 93. 5–7 and 20.

in former ages (III. chap. 93. 5-7 and 20). The present author saw in several European Churches the images of the Madonna or the images or pictures of certain saints worshipped by Christian people that addressed prayers to the image of the Madonna or the pictures of saints for fulfilment of their desires. Therefore, he thinks that it would not be wrong for him to say that the religion of many Christians in Europe is image worship.[2630] The several darśanas (except that of Cārvāka) were looked upon generally as approximations to truth. There was no question of all of them being false and one alone as containing the truth.

(XI) Vast Sanskrit literature.

India produced a vast amount of Sanskrit literature of a most varied character for at least three thousand years. There is no country in the world that can exhibit continuous creation of several departments of literature for such a long period. Sanskrit literature penetrated to countries like Tibet, China, Java and others. Its literature influenced the Moslem world and European world by means of the decimal place value system, its fable literature and system of Vedānta. Vide Winternitz's 'Some problems of Indian Literature' (the Readership Lectures in Calcutta University) pp. 59-81 for a brief but instructive treatment of the influence of Sanskrit Literature in the West. Its study by Europeans at the end of the 18th century and in the 19th century laid the foundation of several sciences, such as the science of language, of comparative religion, of thought and of mythology. There exist several Histories of Sanskrit Literature by several scholars such as Weber, Max Müller, Winternitz, Keith, M. Krishnamachariar, which will give an idea to any reader of the variety and vastness of Sanskrit literature.

2630. Vide 'Hinduism and Buddhism' by Sir Charles Elliot, Vol. I. Intro. p. LXX, where a similar view is expressed by the learned writer who relies also on William James' 'Varieties of religious experience' pp. 525-527. Sir Oliver Lodge in 'Man and the Universe' (London, 1908) pp. 246-247) says "There are plenty of good reasons against idolatry among intellectual and 'chosen' people but this (God was jealous of idol worship) is not one of them; nor is it to be supposed that the stock of a tree is ever really worshipped even when prostrated to. An idol, to ignorant and *undeveloped people, is a symbol of something which they are really worshipping* under a material form and embodiment, the sensuous presentation assists their infantile efforts towards abstract thought as material sacraments help people in a higher stage of religious development; but some of these helps should be outgrown."

India has preserved for itself and for the world a vast literature in the best part of which the principal theme is to ask men never to cease in their efforts to control the senses and to reach higher and higher heights of morality and spirituality. H. H. Gowen in 'A History of Indian Literature' (1931) observes (on p. 8) 'Indian literature has an intrinsic value which no remoteness avails to destroy. For sacredness, variety and continuity, scarcely any other may compare with it, certainly none surpasses it. As for sacredness no other scripture, not even our Bible, may compete with the Veda in its continuity or in the matter of general acceptance'. He dilates also on the variety and remarkable continuity of Indian literature. Classical Sanskrit first blossoned at least before 500 B. C. Pāṇini names at least ten predecessors and his sūtras IV. 3. 87 and 88 clearly indicate that before his time there was considerable non-vedic secular literature.

XII. Yoga: Yoga has been treated of above (pp. 1385–1462). In the whole world there exists hardly any well thought out and comprehensive system of psychical and moral discipline like Yoga. Mercea Eliade observes (on p. 359) in 'Yoga, Immortality and Freedom' (tr. by Willard R. Trask, 1958) 'Yoga constitutes a characteristic dimension of the Indian mind, is marked by reaction against metaphysical speculations and the excesses of a fossilized ritualism'. Western minds having experienced a surfeit of economic prosperity, but worried by the tensions and crises of these times are turning more and more to Yoga and to Indian philosophy such as the Vedānta. In recent years numerous books are being published that deal with 'perennial philosophy', Yoga (including Tibetan Yoga), meditation, concentration, mystical experience &c. Many of these books are written by honest people after reading a good deal of literature on these subjects but they are wanting in any personal yogic or mystic experience. There are some books that are written by persons who want to take advantage of the popular craze for Yoga and similar mystical practices for the sake of wealth and fame. In 'Vedanta for the Western World' edited by Christopher Isherwood (Allen and Unwin, London, 1948) the famous writer Mr. Aldous Huxley sounds a note of warning against the plethora of books on mysticism and Yoga in the market (p. 376).

XIII. Philosophy:

The central point of much of our philosophy is contained in Chāndogyopaniṣad VI.1, where Uddālaka inquires of his conceited

son Śvetaketu "Have you asked for that instruction by which one hears what cannot be heard, by which one perceives what cannot be perceived, by which one knows what cannot be known;' and when Śvetaketu asked for that instruction, Uddālaka expounds to him (in VI. 1–16) the subject at length and winds up with the words 'tat-tvam-asi' (thou art that Self). An inquirer into philosophy will find in the various branches of Indian philosophy a vast mass of material, hardly surpassed by any other ancient country in the world. The word for philosophy is *darśana* and there is a famous work called 'Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha' in which fifteen different points of view apart from *advaita* Vedānta are summarised. The principal orthodox darśanas are six— Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Pūrvamīmāṁsā and Uttaramīmāṁsā' (or Vedānta), which have been treated above and their relation to and influence on Dharmaśāstra has been dwelt upon. The chief marks of Indian philosophy are that it concentrates on the spiritual, that philosophy has to be lived and not merely discussed, that it seeks the Reality, that for real philosophy great moral preparation is necessary, that reason has to be extensively used in arriving at the truth, that tradition and authority have to be accepted and not neglected. Almost all darśanas (except that of Cārvāka) are concerned with Liberation (variously called Mokṣa, Kaivalya, Nirvāṇa, Amṛtatva, Niḥśreyasa, Apavarga) and all (except Cārvāka) are agreed on the doctrine of Karma and Punarjanma. It is not necessary to say more on Indian Philosophy in this Chapter.

XIV. *Arts. Architecture, Sculpture, Painting :*

Though the present author has travelled throughout India for over fifty years and seen most of the famous places rich in ancient architecture, sculpture and painting, he lays no claim to being a connoisseur in these matters and cannot give his own valuation of these relics of ancient Indian Art. The number of works on these is legion. A mere bibliography would not be of much use to the reader. Therefore, he will content himself with mentioning a few works on each of the above branches which he has read wholly or partly or which he consulted.

Among the most remarkable ancient monuments of India are the stūpa at Sāñchī, the paintings in the Ajaṇṭā caves, the

Kailāsa temple at Ellora, and the Koṇārka[2631] temple in Orissa.

Some of the Purāṇas contain information on the above topics. The Matsyapurāṇa (chap. 252. 2-4) names 18 expounders of Vāstuśāstra (architecture) such as Bhṛgu, Atri, Vasiṣṭha, Viśvakarman, Maya, Nārada, Nagnajit, Viśālākṣa, Purandara, Brahmā, Kumāra, Nandīśa, Śaunaka, Garga, Vāsudeva, Aniruddha, Śukra and Bṛhaspati. Chapters 253–257 deal with the construction of mansions and houses, chap. 258–263 with images of several deities. The Vāyupurāṇa (8. 108 ff.) describes the founding of a capital. Agnipurāṇa, chapters 42, 104–106 deal with the building of mansions, houses and laying out cities. The Viṣṇudharmottara (third section) is called *citrasūtra* [2632] because dancing is held to be the primary art and painting rests on it. It is further said that painting is the best of arts (III. 33. 38) and the foremost of auspicious things in a house, that the rules that apply to painting are applicable to the making of images of metals, stone and wood (III. 43.31–32). Chapters 36–43 deal with painting, chapters 44–85 with the making of images of gods and goddesses and housebuilding is dilated upon in chap. 86 ff. The Bṛhat-saṁhitā (ed. by M. M. Sudhakar Dvivedi, 1895) of Varāhamihira (500–550 A.D.) deals with palaces, mansions and houses of king, crown prince and others; in chap. 52 (123 verses) with temples of several gods, in chap. 53 (31 verses) with images of gods, in chap. 57 (Rāma, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Indra, Śiva, Buddha, Jina, the Sun,

2631. For Koṇārka, vide H. of Dh. Vol. IV of 769, Modern Review (Calcutta) for 1945 pp. 67–72 with seven illustrations by Mr. Pranakrushna Samal and 'A time in India' by Ross Smith pp. 198–201 on 'Konarka, its mithunas and several explantions about them.' The tower of the temple of the Sun 24 miles to the N. W. of Puri is 180 feet in height, the Maṇḍapa in front is 140 feet high. In 'Orissan Sculpture and Architecture' by O. C. Ganguly and A. Goswami (1956, Calcutta) out of 41 plates, plates 21-41 relate to the Sun temple of Koṇārka. For Sānchi, three big volumes with numerous plates have been published by the Govt. of India, the editors bein Sir John Marshall, A. Foucher and N. Majumdar.

2632. Vide the present author's 'History of Sanskrit Poetics' (1961) pp. 66–72 for an account of the Viṣṇudharmottara and its date (575–650 A. D.). Dr. Miss Stella Kramrisch has translated into English the chapters of the Viṣṇudharmottara bearing on painting and sculpture (Cal. Un. 1928). Varāha-mihira mentions several authors such as Garga and Manu on palaces (55. 31), Nagnajit (57. 4) and Vasiṣṭha (57. 8) on images.

Liṅga, Mother Goddesses, Yama), with images or statues of five kinds of men (chap. 68 verse 30) called Haṁsa, Śaśa, Rucaka, Bhadra and Mālavya and their bodily features.

There are several other works like the Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja (Calcutta ed. of 1917), the Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi (also called Mānasollāsa)[2633] of king Someśvara, Śilparatna (T. S. S.), Mayamata (T. S. S.) on these subjects.

Paintings —The only famous ancient paintings are those in the caves of Ajanta, in the Bagh caves in the former Gwalior State and those in the caves at Sigiriya in Ceylon. For reasons of space it is not possible to quote the enthusiastic appreciations of Western writers on ancient Indian Art, particularly paintings and sculpture. The author would quote a few passages from Rene Grousset's[2634] works: 'India has given a mighty art or a complete Aesthetic equal in originality and power to the Greek and Chinese. It is marked by its naturalism in depicting animals'. The same writer says about Ajanta's immortal paintings 'they count among the most moving that have ever come within human vision'. 'In civilizations of the East' (tr. by Mrs. C. A. Phillips, London, 1932 with 249 illustrations) the same author (after citing paintings of the Jātakas of self-sacrifice) remarks 'these are but a few examples, the most poetic, tender and moving that could be imagined. No better example could be found of that purely Indian sentiment of universal brotherhood, that fervour of humanitarianism which extends even to animals and plants' (p. 79). For Ajanta, there is a fine edition by Dr. G. Yazdani, the text in two parts (1930 and 1933) and there are besides many coloured and monochrome plates with an Introduction by Lawrence Binyon. There is also another small work prepared for the use of Lord Reading on his visit to Ajanta in 1924 in which Dr. Yazdani gives ten colour plates and one monochrome plate (of a bull fight) with notes on some of the scenes in several caves and appreciations by Binyon, Rothenstein, Solomon and others. Another good book is 'my pilgrimage to Ajanta and Bagh' by Sri Mukul Chandra Dey, with Introduction by Lawrence Binyon (London, 1925)

2633. The third Viṁśati of Mānasollāsa deals with Vāstuśāstra, painting, images of gods and goddesses, planets &c. (vide part II of the work in G. O. S.).

2634. Vide 'The Sum of History' by Rene Grousset, translated by A. & H. Temple Patterson, *Tower Bridge Publications, 1951*, p. 105, p. 107 about Ajanta.

A third book on Ajanta is in Marathi written and published in 1929 by Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, Chief of Aundh State, with half-tone and coloured illustrations. Percy Brown on 'Indian Painting' deals with Buddhist, Hindu and Mahomedan Painting and covers a long period from 6th century A. D. to 19th Century A. D. He gives two illustrations of Sigiriya paintings opposite pp. 33, 69, which are remarkably similar to some paintings in caves 16 and 17 at Ajanta. In Ananda K. Coomaraswamy's 'History of Indian and Indonesian Art' illustrations No. 183 and No. 184 are respectively from Bagh and Sigiriya.

Many modern works deal with all three viz. architecture sculpture and painting or with two of them or with one only Some important works are mentioned here :

1. E. B. Havell's 'Indian Sculpture and Painting' (London, 1908) with 45 plates for sculpture and 8 for painting.
2. V. A. Smith's 'History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon' with 38 illustrations (including some of Moslem Art), Oxford, 1911.
3. A. Foucher's 'Beginnings of Buddhist Art' (1917), with plates.
4. Ananda K. Coomarswamy's 'History of Indian and Indonesian Art' (1927), with 400 illustrations on 128 plates.
5. 'Ellora' by Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, Chief of Aundh with 89 half-tone illustrations, published by D. B. Taraporevala and Sons, Bombay.
6. James Fergusson's 'History of Indian and Eastern Architecture', volumes I and II, London, 1910.
7. T. A. Gopinath Rao's 'Elements of Hindu Iconography,' Vol. I and II (Madras, 1914, 1916).
8. Dr. Stella Kramrisch on 'The Art of India' (sculpture, painting, architecture), London, Phaidon Press, 1954, with 156 plates and 7 coloured plates.
9. Dr. Stella Kramrisch's 'Indian Sculpture' (1933) with 116 illustrations.
10. Rene Grousset's 'The civilizations of the East' Vol. II (on India) with 249 illustrations.
11. A. V. T. Iyer's 'Indian Architecture' in three volumes (Madras).

12. Ananda K. Coomarswamy's 'Elements of Buddhist Iconography' (Harvard Un. Cambridge, U. S. A., 1935); also his 'Dance of Śiva' (frontispiece of Naṭarāja in cosmic dance), Foreword by Romain Rolland, 27 plates, (1924).
13. 'Indian Architecture' (Buddhist and Hindu), published by D. B. Taraporevala and Sons, Bombay, with 118 illustrations.
14. Benjamin Rowland's 'The Art and Architecture of India' (Buddhist, Hindu, Jain), Penguin Books, 1956; remarks that some sculptures are worthy of being placed in world culture and the Art presents synthesis of beautiful forms and deep spiritual expression.
15. Heinrich Zimmer's 'Myths and Symbols of Indian Art and Civilization' posthumously published by J. Campbell, 70 plates from 2nd century B. C. to 19th century A. D.
16. 'Immortal India' by Alfred Nawrath, translated from German, published by D. B. Taraporewala and Sons, Bombay, with 12 coloured and 106 photographic reproductions, 1956.
17. H. Goetz's 'Five thousand years of Indian Art' Bombay, 1959; 72 plates (many coloured ones) and two maps; D. B. Taraporewala and Sons, Bombay.
18. Sir John Marshall's 'Buddhist Art of Gandhāra' Vol. I, Memoir of Archaeological Department of Pakistan, 1960, (111 Plates) and his work in three volumes on 'Taxila' Cambridge Un. Press 1951 for scholars, and his 'Guide to Taxila' (4th ed. of 1960) for tourists and general readers.

South Indian Architecture and Sculpture has some peculiarities of its own. Some works thereon may be mentioned here viz. 'Dravidian Architecture by G. J. Dubreuil (1917), 'Mahabalipuram' by C. Śivarāmamurty (Dept. of Archaeology) 7 full page plates; 'Art of Pallavas' text and notes by B. C. Ganguly and ed. by A. Goswami, 46 plates (1957).

Besides, on music also several works have been written : 'Music of Hindustan' (Oxford 1914) by A. H. Fox Strangway Alain Danielou's 'Northern Indian music' vol. I and II (London, 1949, 1954), H. A. Popley's 'the Music of India', (Calcutta, 1950), O. Goswami's 'The story of Indian Music (Bombay, 1957), G. H. Ranade's 'Hindustani Music and Outline of its Physics

and Aesthetics' (Poona, 1951). But the present author unfortunately knows little about music.

Indian architectonic and iconographic symbolism spread to Java, Bali and other parts of Indonesia and many works have been written on this subject such as 'Barabudor' (Java) by Paul Mus, G. Gorer's 'Bali and Angkor', 'Towards Angkor' by Quaritch Wales (with a full Bibliography at end), W. F. Stutterheim's 'Indian influences in Balinese Art' (London, 1935).

A few more characteristics could have been mentioned; the present writer desists from adding them since the list is already a long one. It is not claimed that no other culture had or has these characteristics. What is claimed is that there is no other single culture in the world where all these can be found now or existed in the past and that some of these characteristics such as the noble Vedānta concept of man, lower animals and even inanimate things being one in Essence, the great tolerance throughout the ages for differing religious and philosophical views, the emphasis on *satya* and *ahiṁsā* are unique and not found elsewhere.

CHAPTER XXXVII

Future Trends

After the battle of Plassey in 1757 the civil government of the three large provinces of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa came under British rule from 1765. From 1818 when the last Peshwa Bajirao II was defeated and became a pensioner, the British were in control over the whole of India except Punjab, which was subdued in 1845. The British left India in 1947. Therefore, they were rulers over a large part of India for 180 years, over the whole of it except Punjab for about 130 years and over Punjab just about 100 years. The impact of British occupation during these periods on Hindu society was tremendous in all spheres, physical, mental and moral. The changes effected during these years of British rule were of such magnitude that they far exceeded the changes that occurred in hundreds of years before the coming of the British. With the advent of British rule came a new system of Government on an all India basis, establishment of courts of justice on Western patterns, laws that applied to all Indians without distinction, modern individualistic liberty, Western pattern of living at least in towns and cities, an educational system placing all Indians on the same level, newspapers, better means of transport, study of modern science, English literature and arts &c.

The present author has no intention of writing anything on the all round changes that have taken place in India under British rule. All that he proposes to do in this chapter is to indicate *briefly* the effects that are likely to be produced on Hindu society, its ancient ideals and values in the near future, on account of science and modern ideas, the Constitution framed for Indian democracy, the idea of a secular State, socialistic pattern of society, economical planning, legislation, growth of population and means to check it.

But before he deals with the above subjects, it is necessary to give a rapid review of the state of things before Independence was achieved. Lord Ripon as Viceroy of India in 1882 started a scheme of local self-government by means of municipal corporations in the cities and district and local Boards in the rural areas. Thus after about 120 years from 1765 when British rule was first established in a large part of India, the British

thought fit to associate the conquered people in managing some of their own (unimportant and petty) affairs. Colonialism on the part of the British had reached its peak by that time. The British imported raw materials like cotton from India, processed them in Manchester and exported the manufactured products back to India's immense market. At the instance of British manufacturers laws were passed in Britain forbidding the import of Indian silk and cotton goods. India was drained of wealth by that policy for over a hundred years and India became one of the poorest countries in the world. Dadabhai Naoroji in his 'Poverty and un-British rule in India' (London, 1901, 675 pages) demonstrated this very ably. The main elements of the colonial rule of Britain were these; complete political subjection existed; the main economic activity was in the hands of foreigners, it was foreign capital that was employed in India and substantial dividends or interest on the capital were guaranteed in some cases like the Railways by the British rulers of India payable from the taxes imposed on Indian people, the control of large enterprises was in foreign hands and directed towards securing foreign interests, the land and people were used as instruments of the purposes of Britain. India got peace and political unity at the cost of enormous poverty and distress and many of the economic problems that beset present day India have to be traced back to the disastrous colonial policies of Britain.

The army of the Government of India was for over a century entirely officered by the British. There were in the 20th century about 7000 officers (lieutenants, captains, majors, colonels) among whom not one Indian held the King's commission till after the first world war. Then a few were sent every year for training to England. The examination for entry in the Indian civil[2635] Service (the 'Steel frame' of the Indian

2635. A well known jibe in the author's youth was that an I. C. S. was neither Indian (almost all were British in those days) nor civil nor a servant (but he was the master of the destinies of poor India). Munro wrote in 1817 a memorandum to Lord Hastings from which two sentences may be quoted : 'there is perhaps no example of any conquest in which the natives have been so completely excluded from all share of the Government of their country as in British India...Foreign conquerors have treated the natives with violence and often wtih great cruelty, but none has treated them with so much scorn as we' pp. 273-74 of 'the Making of Indian Princes' (London, 1943) by Edward Thompson. Vide G. W, Forrest's 'Selections from the Minutes and other official writings of Elphinstone' (London, 1884) p 102 for reproach against British rule in India.

administration, as one great British Prime Minister was pleased to call it) was held in England (in spite of a Resolution of the House of Commons that the examination for appointment to the Indian Civil Servics in 1893 should be held simultaneously in India and England). Only a few Indians in the last quarter of the 19th century could go to England and qualify for entry in that heaven-born service. District officers such as Collectors, District Judges, Police Superintendents, Medical officers (of the Indian Medical Service) were almost all British. Almost all Professors in colleges and the head masters of even some secondary schools were Englishmen. All the books to be used in schools were prescribed by the Head of the Department of Public Instruction in the several provinces, all of whom were Westerners. Even primary education was being given only to a small fraction of the children of school-going age, even in 1947 when the British left. The elements of colonial rule by Britain and the policies pursued by the British rulers are emphasized here solely as warnings to present warring elements in our country that if they pursue their quarrels to bitter ends the nation may again be plunged into a miserable state by invasions from powerful and hostile neighbours.

Morley (who was Secretary of State for India and who was believed by many Indians to be a man of liberal or even radical views) introduced separate communal electorates for Moslems in the reforms of 1909 and he was firmly of opinion that a Parliamentary system in India should not be established in the foreseeable[2636] future. It is unnecessary to refer in detail to Montagu's famous speech in 1917, characterizing the Indian Government as too wooden, too antediluvian for modern times, to his statement (the reverse of Morley's views) that ' the policy of the British Government is the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realiza-

---

2636. *Vide* the volume of " Indian Speeches " by Viscount Morley (p. 92) where he says " If my existence, either officially or corporeally, were prolonged twenty times longer than either of them is likely to be, a Parliamentary system in India is not at all the goal to which I would for one moment aspire ". Even so late as 1941 Sir G. Schuster in " India and Democracy " (MacMillan, 1941) strongly expressed the view that Parliamentary democracy of the Westminster pattern would not suit India and that Indians would have to work out a system of their own. He does not even indicate how, while the British ruled India, a democratic system could be evolved by Indians and in how many years.

tion of responsible Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire,' the failure of Dyarchy introduced by Montagu, the Rowlatt Acts, unrest in Punjab, General Dyer's proclamation declaring any assembly of four or more persons as unlawful, his shooting of men, women and children assembled in Jallianwallah Bagh for a meeting in defiance of the proclamation, when, even according to Government statistics, 300 people were killed and 1200 injured, Dyer's compulsory retirement and the presentation of a purse of thirty thousand pounds to him by his British admirers for saving the British Empire (as they then thought).

The introduction of education through English was espoused by Lord Macaulay in his 'Minute on Indian Education'. Why he insisted on the education of Indians through English is stated in the Minute as follows: 'We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and intellect'.[2637] English education caused great wastage of effort in learning all subjects (including even Sanskrit) through English and led to a disproportionate pursuit of literary studies and neglect of scientific and technological subjects and created a wide gulf between the educated and the uneducated masses; it glorified Western culture and did not help Indians to study and appreciate their own culture. Educated Indians, particularly in the earlier period of English education in India, came to entertain an exaggerated respect for Western institutions and unduly disparaged their own social and religious systems.

The British Government's interest in Indian education (particularly higher education) was lukewarm. Three Universities (of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras) were first established in 1857 for the whole of India, but they were merely examining bodies. In the whole of the Bombay Presidency there was no Science Institute entirely maintained by Government till about

2637. Vide 'Speeches by Lord Macaulay' with Minute on Indian Education, edited by G. M. Young (Oxford Un, Press 1952). The minute is on pp. 344-361. On p. 349 he makes the following statement 'I have conversed both here and at home with men distinguished by their proficiency in the Eastern tongues. *I have never found one among them who could deny that a single shelf of a good European Library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia.*' Vide p. 359 of the above work for the above oft-quoted passage.

1920. An Indian could pass the M. A. examination in Philosophy without knowing anything about ancient Indian philosophy till only a few years ago. However, English education by Government and missionaries produced a result exactly opposite of what was expected by them. The missionaries miserably failed in securing the Indians (except a few among the lower castes and *ādivāsis*) for Christ and Government found that reading the classics of English literature and works of men like Burke, Spencer, Mill and others created among the educated emotions of nationalism and discontent with their own abject political status. Political agitation daily increased. Lokamanya Tilak was called 'the father of Indian unrest' by an English writer. He passed away in 1920. But his mantle fell on Mahatma Gandhi, who while agitating for political power and eventual freedom, adopted the technique of *satyāgraha*.

It is not necessary to go into the freedom struggle from 1919 to 1947 which culminated in the British leaving India but after dividing it into Pakistan and the present India. The partition of India into two parts based on merely communal considerations let loose the most hideous conflicts, massacres and flights of millions of refugees which India had ever witnessed during its long history. The giving up of a large empire with mutual consent and without war or bloodshed is a unique and unparalleled event in the whole history of the world. The message of the King of Great Britain read by Lord Mountbatten as Viceroy to the members of the Constituent Assembly was nobly and graciously worded " With this transfer of power by consent comes the fulfilment of a great democratic ideal to which the British and Indian people alike are firmly dedicated.' Dr. Rajendra Prasad's reply to the message of the King was couched in equally noble and just language 'While our achievement is in no small measure due to our sufferings and sacrifices, it is also the result of world forces and events, and last, though not least, it is the consummation and fulfilment of the historic traditions and democratic ideals of the British race" (vide 'Transfer of power in India" by Shri V. P. Menon, published by Orient Longmans, 1957, p. 415).

The Indian Independence Act[2637A] was passed by the British

2637 A. Vide 'Transfer of Power in India'; Appendix XI sets out the Indian Independence Act, 1947 at pp. 516-532 and Appendix XII gives Congress comments on the draft independence bill with Nehru's corrections signed by him on 3-7-47 (pp. 1-9).

Parliament and Royal assent was given on 18th July 1947. A Constituent Assembly had been set up by the cabinet mission (of three cabinet ministers, Pethick Lawrence, Secretary of State for India, Stafford Cripps and A. V. Alexander) and it held its first meeting in December 1946. It re-assembled in August 1947 as a sovereign body to frame a constitution for free India. Its work went on for over two years and the constitution consisting of 395 Articles and nine Schedules came into force on 26th January 1950 (except 15 Articles that came into force at once); vide Art. 394.

The Preamble to the Constitution of India declares that India is a sovereign democratic Republic. The extent of the Indian Republic even at present is vast. It was hardly ever under one Government, except possibly under Aśoka. In ancient times India had some *gaṇarājyas* or *saṅgharājyas* (oligarchic states, or republics as Jayaswal and some others prefer to call them). This question of the existence of oligarchies (or republics) in ancient India has been discussed at some length by the present author in Vol. III pp. 87–96 of the H. of Dh. He still adheres to the views there expressed. The Buddhist monks had a procedure for regulating the meetings of their *saṅgha* (as set out in the Mahāvagga IX. 3 in SBE Vol. XVII p. 264 ff and in Cullavagga IV. 9, SBE Vol. XX pp. 24–27 and pp. 53 ff) and Jayaswal conjectures that the same procedure was followed in oligarchies (or republics).

There are substantial achievements to the credit of present India and its leaders during the last 14 years after Independence. Some of them may be very succinctly stated here: (1) The production of a comprehensive democratic constitution guaranteeing freedom of speech and worship, freedom of the Press, protection of the rights of minorities, equality of all before the law, equality of status to women, independent judiciary; (2) Abolition of untouchability (Art. 17); (3) political integration of India without any violence, as the five hundred and odd States (except only three), that comprised nearly 1/3rd of the total land area of India and 1/4th of the population, patriotically accepted a merger of the States in the Indian Republic (Shri. V. P. Menon's 'Story of the Integration of States'); (4) Reorganization of India into 15 States and six Union Territories based mostly on linguistic unity and administrative convenience; (5) holding two elections on the basis of

adult suffrage, viz. every person [2637b] (male or female) who is a citizen of India, is twenty-one years of age and not disqualified under the constitution or any other law, has a right to be registered as a voter at elections to the House of the people and to the Legislative Assemblies of States (Art. 326); (6) Socialistic pattern of society as the goal (Art. 38, 39); (7) Two five year plans have been carried out and a third Five Year Plan has been set on foot (under Schedule VII, list III, item 20). The creation of a democratic republic was something that India had not been acquainted with for at least twelve centuries (even if *gaṇarājyas* were held to be republics and not merely obligarchies). From Ṛgvedic times there was a hereditary monarchical form of rule. Vide Ṛg. VII. 33.3 and 5, VII. 83. 7-8, where the battle of ten kings (daśa rājānaḥ) with king Sudās is mentioned; vide also the story of Devāpi and Śantanu in Ṛg. X. 98 expanded in Nirukta II. 10-12.

Some criticism may be offered against the Constitution. In the first place, it is extremely bulky and goes into too many details and is a hotchpotch of provisions from several sources. Some provisions are derived from England, the directive principles of State policy are derived from the constitutions of Ireland and other countries of Europe, some are borrowed from the Government of India Act of 1935. Several of these need not have been put in a Constitution but should have been left to ordinary legislation. In spite of such a lengthy constitution there are many omissions. Nothing is expressly said about political parties, about industrial corporations, about relation of religions and the State. The Constitution makes a complete break with our traditional ideas. Dharmasūtras and Smṛtis begin with the dharmas (duties) of the people (varṇas and āśramas). Prime Minister Pandit Nehru himself says in his Azad Memorial Lectures on 'India to-day and to-morrow' (1959) p. 45 'All of us now talk of and demand rights and privileges, but the teaching of the old dharma was about duties and obligations. Rights follow duties discharged.' Unfortunately this thought finds no place in the Constitution.

One fact of the greatest importance in the life of India is the accession of the masses to power, not only political, but also

---

2637 b. Women had no votes in Great Britain till the first war and even now in Switzerland women have no votes (vide p. 31 of 'Switzerland in perspective' by George Soloveytchik (1954).

social, economical, intellectual and moral. The Constitution engenders a feeling among common people that they have rights and no obligations whatever and that the masses have the right to impose their will and to give the force of law and justice to their own ideas and norms formed in their own cottages and tea shops.

The Constitution of India has no chapter on the duties of the people to the country or to the people as a whole. Art. 19 confers the right to seven freedoms, one of which (c) is to form associations or unions and sub-article (4) enables the State to make laws imposing, *in the interest of public order or morality*, reasonable restrictions. The framers of the Constitution forgot to include what Britain had provided long before in 17 and 18 Geo. 5, Chapter 22, Article 1, part of which runs 'any strike is illegal if it is *designed* or *calculated* to coerce the Government directly or by inflicting hardship on the community'. The eyes of some of the framers of this constitution were opened by the strike of Government servants in the Railways, Posts and Telegraphs by which, if it had continued for even a fortnight, crores of people would have had to submit to incalculable hardships and the action of the strikers in essential services would have been like a rebellion by some lakhs of people against over forty crores of people. The right to strike by workers tacitly given in the constitution is in imitation of similar rights enjoyed in industrial countries like Britain only for the last few decades and the framers should have restricted the right to strikes between private employers and employees as an experiment in the first instance.

Another criticism is that there are too many amendments. From 1950 there have been ten amendments, while in the U. S. A. there have been only 22 amendments during a period of about 170 years. The very first amendment was made within less than a year and a half from the day the Constitution came into force. It affected about a dozen Articles, among which there were three Articles dealing with fundamental rights viz. 15, 19, 31. One fails to understand the meaning of the words 'fundamental rights' in a constitution which took over two years of deliberations, if they could be changed within a year and a half. The amendment made in Article 31 prohibits a person from challenging in a court of justice a law about the compensation to be paid to a person for compulsory acquisition of his property. This is a serious inroad on rights to private property

and smacks of spoliation and arbitrariness. In the House of the People the quorum is only 50 and if 50 persons are present and a majority of them (say 26) decide that a certain amount of compensation should be paid for compulsory acquisition of several properties of a person and the compensation is felt to be ridiculously low he has no remedy in a court of law at all. Besides, the Welfare State is, if at all, foreshadowed in the Directive Principles of State Policy (Art. 38, 39 etc.), but these principles are not enforceable in a court of law and, therefore, they are inferior to fundamental rights, the breach of which can be examined by the High Court or Supreme Court, which is invested with the power of issuing writs. Parliament (Lokasabha) has over 500 members and the quorum is 50 and yet this small number is not often present and the Speaker has several times to reprimand the House of the People on this score.

Another criticism my be offered as to the inclusion of Universities in list II (of schedule 7, State List, No. 11) and not in the concurrent list. Vocational and technical training of labour is in the concurrent list (Item 25). Is not University education throughout India of as much importance as the training of labour? Only items 63–66 (of list I, Union list) are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Central Government.[2638] There is hardly any weighty reason (except chance) why the Benares Hindu University, the Aligarh Muslim University, the Delhi University and Santiniketan should be treated as the exclusive concern of the Central Government and the other Universities be not placed even in the concurrent list.

The Constitution in its 8th Schedule recognizes fourteen languages as the national languages of India, while Article 343 (1) makes Hindi the official language of the Union, but sub-article 2 (of Article 343) provides that English will continue to be used for all official purposes for fifteen years and sub-article 3 provides that Parliament may continue even after 1965 the use of English for purposes specified by Parliament. Even such a small country as Switzerland has three official languages. The Constitution should have provided at least two Official languages for north India and two for South India, when even

---

2638. Vide 'Our fundamental rights' by D. N. Banerjee for an exhaustive and trenchant criticism of the change made in Art. 31 (2), the speeches of the Prime Minister and of Hon'ble Mr. G. B. Pant (pp. 316–336) Calcutta, 1960

in 1950 the population of India was about 36 crores. This sweeping decision to make Hindi the only official language instead of helping emotional integration of Indians produced great strife. An official language is not the only means of emotional integration, nor even the chief one. The Govt. should begin with the children in the schools, should instil into their minds the fundamental cultural Unity of India, and that India has been looked upon as one by all foreign invaders, steps should be taken to make every Indian feel that he is the inheritor of the vast ancient wisdom and spiritual culture of India, that he must contribute to the conservation of that culture, and must add to its greatness in the future, and free and compulsory education for all children up to the age of 14 should have been achieved in ten years as foreshadowed in Art. 45.

A plan and programme to instil among all grown-up citizens the ideal of national integration must be prepared, insisting on our common past, common interests, common future and on elements like the wisdom and thought embodied in Sanskrit and the regional languages, the tolerance shown by our people through the ages.

The Constitution has also committed several mistakes in the allotment of subjects in the 7th Schedule as Union list, State List and Concurrent list. For example, the production, manufacture, possession, transport, purchase and sale of intoxicating liquors are put in the State List (item 8 in List II, State List) This has led to prohibition in some States, but also its absence in other States.

The above discussion is enough to show that the Constitution framed after more than two years' cogitation is unsatisfactory in several ways.

Ours is a democratic Republic. The most famous definition of democracy is Lincoln's viz. ' Government of the people by the people for the people '. All three must exist in a proper democracy. In the Greek city States such as Athens all adult citizens (except slaves that outnumbered citizens) could assemble and could directly participate in discussion and the framing of laws and regulations. But this is impossible when crores of people spread over a vast country are voters. Therefore, one part of Lincoln's definition becomes watered down. Crores of people cannot govern themselves, which is a physical impossibility. All they can do is to choose some men as their rulers. In former ages when monarchy

was the prevailing form the ruler came to be so by succession or by conquest i. e. by breaking heads. Now, under democracy, the ruler or rulers are chosen by the mere counting of heads. As observed by Dr. Radhakrishnan in 'Kalkin or the future of civilization' (4th ed. of 1956) 'Democracy in actual working rarely permits a country to be governed by its ablest. The opinions of the mass prevail over those of the thinking few. We must strive for some better way for conducting human affairs than the lottery of the ballot-box' (pp. 20–22). René Guenon in 'Crisis of the modern world' (translated by Arthur Osborne, London, 1932) remarks 'the law is supposed to be made by the opinion of the majority, but what is overlooked is that this opinion is something that can very easily be guided or modified i. e. opinion can be manufactured. The majority on whatever question it may be called on to give its opinion is always composed of the incompetent, whose number is vastly greater than that of the men who can give an opinion based on a full knowledge of the subject' (p. 108).

These words of René Guenon refer to conditions in European countries in most of which there has been almost cent per cent literacy for some decades. Parliamentary democracy assumes that voters understand the policies and programmes of different parties and cast their votes accordingly. It presupposes some education, intelligence, respect for the rule of law, tolerance, a sense of brotherhood for at least one's countrymen, and a more or less homogeneous society. But when, as in India at present, the vast majority of voters are illiterate, the state of things becomes far worse. We can and must tolerate democracy in India as a first step towards better days, though at present it is a mere shell and is ridiculed by some unsympathetic foreigners.[2639] The census of 1961 discloses that literacy which was only 16.6 percent in 1951 is 23·7 percent in 1961. Dean Inge in 'Christian Ethics' (1930) remarks about politics in England where almost all voters are literate 'our politics are so corrupt that many would welcome a dictatorship.' (p. 385). About the U. S. A., a recent work 'Corruption in Washington' by Blair Bolles (Gollancz, London, 1960), which makes rather dismal reading, indicates the terrible moral predicament of the honest man in power caught between public responsibility and loyalty

---

2639. A. Koestler in 'Lotus and Robot' (London, 1960) remarks 'India is a democracy in name only, it would be more correct to call it Bapucracy' (p. 156).

to his friends and associates. In our country also ministers and officials must be in a similar predicament, particularly when there exist numerous rules and regulations about permits and licenses galore.

The Directive Principles of state policy are contained in Articles 37 to 51 and it is provided in Article 37 that they shall not be enforceable by any court, but that they are *fundamental* in the governance of the country. Article 45 enacts that the State shall endeavour to provide within a period of ten years from the commencement of this constitution *for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years.* It is more than twelve years since the commencement of the Constitution. In spite of the fact that about 7000 crores of rupees were to be spent on grandiose schemes in the two Five Year Plans, this fundamental provision was not implemented. Even free and compulsory primary education of all children up to the age of *eleven* years (instead of 14 as envisaged in Article 45) is not accomplished and it is promised that in the Third Five Year Plan (which envisages an expenditure of over ten thousand crores of rupees) this may be accomplished. But, if the huge sums for the third plan be not forthcoming, the first casualty will be education. The education of the masses who are to be voters and indirectly rulers of the nation continues to be sadly neglected even after Independence.

It is remarkable that the directive principles of state policy mostly contain provisions on the economic system for raising people's standard of living (Art. 43, 47 &c.), i. e. it lays emphasis only on the material things for the people. It seems to be assumed that if material prosperity or benefits are assured for all, then there is nothing more to be done by the State. The present author feels that the Directive Principles should also have put equal or greater emphasis on moral and spiritual values and should have called upon the State to promote among the people high moral standards, self-discipline, co-operation, sense of responsibility, kindliness, high endeavour. Man is a many-sided being. The satisfaction of mere physical needs is not enough. Man has intellectual, spiritual, cultural and social aspirations also. The socio-economic pattern for the future must be based on the foundation of the best part of our traditions, the rule of dharma, the duties common to all as declared by Manu X. 63 and Yāj. I. 122. A secular state should not and does not mean a godless state or a state that has nothing to do with moral and

spiritual values. Prime Minister Nehru himself emphasizes this, when he says ' whether religion is necessary or not, a *certain faith in a worth-while ideal is essential* to give substance to our lives and to hold us together. We have to have *a sense of purpose beyond the material* and *physical* demands of our daily lives ' (in 'Today and tomorrow' p. 8). It may be stated that for most common men and women it is religion that sets worth-while ideals.

The third item in Lincoln's definition is 'for the people'. That is, the Government must look to the good of the people as a whole and not to that of any class or a community in the country. Modern democracy has come to mean parties and it has to work on decisions of the majority. It often happens that, there being several parties, no one party has an absolute majority over all other parties put together. It may often happen that one party secures 40% of the votes actually cast and the other parties (that differ in ideologies) secure, say 25, 20, 15, percent of the votes, then the first party with only 40 percent of the total votes cast rules, though it does not represent the majority of the whole country. The party system generally leads to a struggle for power and lowers the moral standards of the whole people, particularly when hardly one-fifth of the voters (both male and female) can read and write their own regional language. The present author does not hold that illiteracy necessarily means absence of intelligence. But, unless a man can read for himself and ponder over what he reads, he can hardly be a good judge of the *pros* and *cons* in relation to a measure or policy placed before the voters. Besides, the emphasis laid on standards of living without any direct reference to moral and spiritual values has already led to this result that in India the desire for material comforts and positions of power dominates almost every one and there is no corresponding urge or even idea to do one's best for producing goods. The laws are drafted in the English language. Most of the speakers in Parliament use English (a few only speak in Hindi) and complicated laws are said to have been passed by a majority or unanimously as the case may be. That country may be said to be the best governed which is least governed. There is a spate of legislation in the House of the People. In the seven years from 1950 to 56 nearly 450 laws were passed by the central legislature alone. Some of these laws vitally affect Hindus in their family relations and in other respects. A few examples only can be cited here. The Hindu Adoption Act went far beyond the ancient Hindu principles, which were two viz. that

only a male could be adopted for purposes of spiritual benefit to the adopter and the person to be adopted should be in age and other matters like a son. Women could not adopt to themselves but a widow could adopt a son for the spiritual benefit of her husband. These principles have been thrown to the winds as will be seen from the criticisms of the present author above on pp. 1337-1338. But one thing must be mentioned. In some enactments affecting Hindu Law, customs have been abrogated: vide Hindu Marriage Act 25 of 1955, Section 4, Hindu Succession Act 30 of 1956, Section 4 (1). The Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act (78 of 1956) prescribes that the person to be adopted must not be more than 15 years of age (section 10 item IV) and that there should be a difference of 21 years between a male adopter and a female adoptee and between a female adopter and a male adoptee (sec. 11 items iii and iv). But the provision in Sec. 10 is made subject to a custom to the contrary. It passes one's understanding why custom was allowed to prevail over the law in this case. The Hindu Marriage Act, 25 of 1955, has made sweeping changes of which the vast majority of Hindus are blissfully ignorant. Before the Act a Hindu could in theory (and rarely in practice) have two or more wives living at the same time and even an *anuloma* marriage (i. e. the marriage of a male of a higher *varṇa* with a woman born in a *lower varṇa*) was held to be invalid by some High Courts in India such as those of Allahabad and Madras. Now under the present Hindu Marriage Act of 1955 the marriage is a monogamous marriage (section 5) and a person belonging to any caste may marry a woman of any caste how highsover or lowsoever she may be by caste; and further marriages between spouses belonging to the Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist or Jaina religions are now declared valid. It was suggested, while the marriage Bill was in the Committee stage, that the provision as to monogamous marriages should become compulsory when a similar provision would be made applicable to Muslims (who under the Koranic law can have four wives at the same time). But this was brushed aside through fear of antagonizing Muslims. Other provisions about Buddhists, Jains and Sikhs being Hindus for the purposes of the Marriage Act, being a sweeping one at one stroke, is likely to be resented by almost all illiterate Hindus and likely to lead to tension and bitterness in many rural families and to break-up of the family as a central and compact unit in Hindu society. The orthodox people do not like such mixed marriages. It is not

unlikely that the orthodox sections in the country may join hands with the ignorant masses and set back the hands of the clock, when some years hence the ranks of the towering personalities of the Gandhi era whom people want to humour have become thin.[2640]

One of the outstanding characteristics of Hindu society for several millennia has been the joint family system of the Mitākṣarā type which prevails in the whole of India (except in Bengal which is under the Dāyabhāga system). Its peculiarity is that all male members in the family form a coparcenary, that if any male of the family dies his interest devolves by survivorship on the remaining male members including his own male issue, if any, that females have no rights in the family property except marriage expenses and maintenance and no member of the joint family could transfer any part of the family property by will (not even the father) or by sale or mortgage except for certain recognised family necessities. This joint family system and the caste system were the bulwarks that kept together Hindu Society for centuries, inspite of foreign invasions and misrule. The Hindu Succession Act (30 of 1956) makes two sweeping changes in the Mitākṣarā joint family system. The explanation to Section 30 of the Act provides that any male Hindu may dispose of by will his interest in the coparcenary property. This is one drastic change. A similar drastic change was made by section 6, its proviso and explanation read together. Briefly it comes to this. If a Hindu coparcener of the Mitākṣarā system dies after the Succession Act comes into force, leaving him surviving no son, but a daughter or the daughter of a predeceased son or the son of a predeceased daughter or daughter of a predeceased daughter, his interest in the coparcenary property will not pass by survivorship to the other surviving male members of the coparcenary but to the above mentioned descendants of his and the interest that would pass to these descendants would be the share in the coparcenary property that would have been allotted to him if partition of the coparcenary property had taken place immediately before his death. Before this Act, the daughter or the other heirs mentioned above would have got nothing in the coparcenary property when any male member of the family died sonless. These two changes make of the joint family of the Mitākṣarā

2640. Vide what Mr. Frank Moraes says (on p. 85) in his biography of the Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru (1956) about people being anxious to humour him.

type a mere shell. It was suggested when the Bill was before Parliament that Parliament should provide that the joint family system of the Mitākṣarā type has been abrogated and that all members of the joint family after the passing of the Act would be only tenants-in-common. But this was not done. Why the Minister in charge or the members of Parliament felt squeamish about ending the coparcenary system of the Mitākṣarā is not clear to the present author. It looks like straining at a gnat while swallowing a camel. These and other changes in the old Hindu Law are possibly motivated by the desire to do justice to the rights of women. But in some cases this is done with a vengeance. For reasons of space only one example of this type is cited. Under Section 8 of the Hindu Succession Act and the Schedule of heirs in class I and class II, if a man dies possessed of property leaving only his mother and father (and no sons or wife or other persons) the mother will take the whole estate of her son absolutely to the entire exclusion of the father, since the mother is placed among heirs of class I., while the father is placed in class II and the rule in Sec. 8 (a and b) is that heirs put in class II succeed only if there is no heir in class I. Under Yāj. II. 135 the order of heirs to a man dying without male issue is first the widow, then daughter, then daughter's son or sons, then parents (*pitarau*, the dual is used). Some commentators held that the mother is to be preferred as heir to the father, others held that the father is to be preferred to the mother, while still others held that both parents should succeed together. In the Council of States (Rājyasabhā) the father was put in class I along with the mother, but in the House of the People the mother was put in class I and the father was put as heir in class II. Article 15 of the Constitution prohibits discrimination on the ground of sex, religion, race &c. What difference can be made between the mother and the father of a man as heirs except on the ground of sex ? Probably, the legislators wanted, in however small a way, to compensate women for past injustices to them. The Hindu Law of Succession of 1956 goes even beyond Muslim Law in that it recognizes twelve categories of persons (in class I of Schedule) as entitled to succeed simultaneously and take the property of the deceased. In a few cases it is possible that the heirs of class I taking the estate of a deceased person may be twenty or even more, if the latter leaves five sons and five daughters, besides some children of predeceased sons and daughters. There is probably no country in the world where so many persons are entitled to succeed simultaneously to

a deceased person's estate. The result would be that there would be great fragmentation of property and constant wrangles and litigation. This amounts to distribution of poverty. Under the Hindu Law before 1956 women as heirs to males took as a general rule a limited estate (i. e. a life estate). For example, if a man died leaving his wife and a brother or a brother's son (but no children) his widow would take a limited estate i. e. on the widow's death, the estate would go to the brother (if alive) or to the latter's sons &c. Now (after 1956) the widow would take an absolute estate and she would be able to dispose of it as she pleased (by sale, gift or will). Vide Section 14 of the Hindu Succession Act of 1956. Not only this, that section has retrospectively conferred an absolute estate on the widows who succeeded as limited owners before 1956. Suppose a person died in 1950, leaving a widow and a brother. The widow would take only a limited estate and she could not sell it or will it away; if she died before 1956 the husband's brother would have succeeded to the estate. But suppose she is alive and in possession of her husband's estate when the Act of 1956 was passed. Her estate is at once enlarged. She can donate it to any one or leave it by her will to her own brother and entirely destroy the expectancy of the husband's brother to succeed to her husband's estate. This is equality of women with a vengeance The mass of people know nothing about this at present. But when many cases come before the courts and the common people come to know the present law whereby the expectancies of male members of her husband's family are set at naught by the widow transferring the property to persons that are strangers there is bound to be great trouble. Of all the revolutionary changes in India none will have more pervading influence and meaning than the drastic changes in the legal status of women made by the laws affecting Hindus passed from 1954 to 1956, which enforce monogamy, make polygamy punishable, which provide the minimum ages for the marriage of women and men at 15 and 18 respectively, which allow divorce to both sexes on the same basic rules, which confer rights of inheritance and absolute ownership on a daughter and her children, that allow the husband or the widow of a person, if the deceased had not already adopted a son and a daughter before his death, to adopt a son and a daughter.

Several States (e. g. Bombay by Act LXVII of 1948, sec. 5) have passed laws putting ceilings on the extent of the holding

of lands up to 48 acres or 24 acres according as the land is ordinary or *bagait* (irrigated). This is felt by common people as a great injustice, when there is no ceiling on the wealth of big merchants and the like. It may be argued that these very rich people pay income-tax and other taxes. The agriculturists also say that they pay taxes and that inflation has made the price of bare necessities go up.

Before leaving the subject of legislation vitally affecting Hindu society, some remarks will have to be made about the mentality of several Congressmen who appear to have great faith in making men moral by legislation. Article 47 provides that it is among the primary duties of the State to raise the level of nutrition, the standard of living of its people and the improvement of public health and that, in particular, the State shall endeavour to bring about prohibition of the consumption of intoxicating drinks and of drugs which are injurious to health. The Bombay State and a few other States in India embarked on a policy of total prohibition of intoxicating drinks. If there was to be a total prohibition of intoxicating drinks, it should have been an all India measure. Several States refused to have the prohibition law because there is loss of revenue in two ways, viz. the income from excise duties on liquors is lost and large sums of money have to be spent on establishments for preventing people from manufacturing illicit liquor. Art. 45 about free and compulsory education of children of school-going age (up to 14 years) was not strenuously observed by the Bombay State but it wanted to enforce Art. 47 at all costs. Besides, there being no prohibition on an all India basis, what is an offence under law in the Bombay State is not an offence in Delhi and some other States at all. That takes away the moral basis from the measure. Besides, prohibitionists forget human psychology. When something is prohibited or becomes rare, many feel a fascination in breaking the law or trying to possess what is rare. Illicit liquor produced and kept under the most unhygienic conditions is being sold on a large scale and persons knowing this dare not inform the police for fear of being stabbed or killed by distillers of illicit liquor.[2640a] A

2640a. L. P. Jacks in "Near the brink" remarks 'Social Reform might be defined as the process of creating the social problems of tomorrow by Acts of Parliament designed to solve the social problems of today' (p. 116) and on p. 118 he says that he never saw so many drunken people as during the years when prohibition was in force.

Minister's cook was found engaged in manufacturing illicit liquor. In the present author's opinion prohibition has turned out to be a dismal failure, it tends to corrupt the police, it reduces revenue much needed for development purposes, illicit distillation has become a cottage industry and boot-leggers have acquired a vested interst in prohibition. Why horse-racing and betting are not prohibited by law is inexplicable, except on the supposition that many people entertain that Government is afraid of displeasing rich people who indulge in it. Wine and gambling have been besetting sins from the times of the Ṛgveda. Vasiṣṭha pleads for forgiveness of sins from Varuṇa in Ṛgveda VII. 86.6 saying that 'it is not one's own power that leads one to commit sin, it is fate, wine, anger, dice (gambling) and thoughtlessness'. In Ṛg. X. 34 a gambler laments over his own frailty. Therefore, all that can be reasonably attempted is temperance and reducing the spread of the drinking habit; otherwise new and greater evils not contemplated in the ardour for suppression emerge. Vide p. 1338 above for the warning given against startling changes based on Mr. Aldous Huxley's words. Another faddist attempt at improving morals by legislation is the recent Act prohibiting dowries, which came into force on first July 1961. The giving or taking or abetting the giving or taking of dowry or demanding a dowry directly or indirectly from the parents or guardians of a bride or bridegroom is punishable with imprisonment extending to six months or with fine extending to five thousand rupees or with both. The definition of dowry punishable[2641] under the Act is rendered practically nugatory by the explanation that presents made at the time of a marriage to either party to the marriage in the form of cash, ornaments, clothes or other articles, shall not be deemed to be dowry within the meaning of the section, unless they are made as consideration for the marriage of the said parties. This, instead of relieving the parents of marriageable girls from the payment of a dowry, would give rise to blackmail on the part of busy bodies in the town or the village of the parties. If this latter does not happen the Act will ordinarily remain a dead letter.

2641. The Act defines 'dowry' as 'any property or valuable security given or agreed to be given either directly or indirectly (a) by one party to the marriage to the other party to the marriage or (b) by the parents of either party to a marriage or by any other person, to either party to the marriage or to any other person at or before or after the marriage as consideration for the marriage of the said parties, but does not include dower or Mahr in the case of persons to whom the Muslim Personal Law applies'.

Article 40 of the Constitution calls upon the State to organize village Panchayats and to endow them with the powers and authority necessary to enable them to function as units of self-government. In ancient and medieval times, village Panchayats played an important part. Under the British this system (which trained people in democratic functions on a small scale) was practically done away with. Now after about two hundred years the present Government wants to revive Panchayats. In the different States of India village Panchayat Acts have been passed. Until a large percentage of villagers become educated, self-reliant and men of character, the village Panchayats cannot function as the foundations of real democracy. It is very likely that either the dominant castes or the leading families or the bullies (*guṇḍas*) in the village will capture the village Panchayats and use them for their own benefit A recent book 'Panchayt-i-raj' by Shri S. A. Dey (published by Asia Publishiug House, 1961) paints a very roseate picture of Panchayats functioning in the 550 thousand villages of India. It all depends on disinterested workers of high character; otherwise this project will meet the same fate that overtook Brayne's work in Gurgaon after Brayne left.

Some people took it into their heads to decide that agricultural land should belong to him who tilled it. Therefore, in Bombay and some other States legislation was enacted, first holding that he who tilled another's land for six years was to be regarded as a 'protected tenant' (i. e. practically a permanent tenant); later on the owner was prohibited from selling the land to a non-agriculturist and ultimately (by Bombay Act. LXVII of 1948, sec. 32) the tenant was made the owner, being liable to pay to the original owner the price fixed by the Revenue authorities spread over twelve yearly instalments. Whatever may be the case in Zamindaris, in the Deccan and some South Indian States the Ryotwari system prevails and persons belonging to the lower middle class purchased lands at high prices (not getting more than three or four percent as rent on the money invested) as land was deemed a stable investment. The present author, having been a practising lawyer for forty-five years, knows personally thousands of village people. In many cases although four or five years have passed away, the Revenue authorities have not yet decided the prices of the lands over which ownership of erstwhile tenants has been declared. Most of the erstwhile tenants (now become owners) have not paid a pie for four years

and the real owners have been robbed of the benefit to be derived from the price, if paid. Supposing Government was solicitous of increasing production by making tenants owners there is no reason why Government should not have recovered the price or instalments as a revenue demand. There is no judicial probe in the ordinary courts of law, the appeal lies only to the Govt. (that means to the Collector), no owner is entitled to engage a pleader (sec. 80 A) and very complicated provisions are made if the former tenant fails to pay each instalment. But the present state of things is sheer spoliation and looks like robbing Peter to pay Paul and is a sample of what democracy might mean to people of the lower middle class. There is no evidence that by these measures production of food grains has greatly increased. But Congressmen are complacent because they know that in the elections the vast majority of illiterate agriculturists who are to benefit by such legislation will cast their votes in favour of ' oxen ' adopted as symbol by the Congress party. Many States have introduced by legislation ceilings in land holdings, viz. no man or family is to hold more then 48 acres of dry land and no more than 24 acres of irrigated land. Even agriculturists have now begun to grumble and to ask why no ceilings are placed on the accumulation of wealth, when they see rich people flaunting their wealth in cars eighteen or twenty feet in length, obstructing narrow roads and causing serious casualties.[2642] Most people complain that the poor are getting poorer and the rich richer under the policies of the present Government. Government is not able to hold the price line and agriculturists, workers in industries and the lower middle class are dissatisfied and there is great danger of communistic ideas spreading among the majority of the inhabitants of this ancient land, that once honoured sages. Prime Minister Nehru said on the Congress manifesto for the elections of 1962[2643] ' If the great majority of people in India for some reason or other become communists in the sense of thinking that way, it may be good or bad, I do not know, but I

2642. A survey carried on by the Police authorities for some months in Greater Bombay (population 41 lakhs) this year disclosed that motor accidents on an average caused one death every day, 13 people were injured and several dozens of accidents occurred every day in which motor cars were involved but no man was killed or injured.

2643. Quoted in Prof. V. K R. V. Rao's paper in ' Changing India ' p. 241 in the Volume of papers presented to Prof. D. R. Gadgil on his 61st birth-day.

am quite convinced it would not be India, then it would be something else. I do not want that to happen, even though I want India to take up modern scientific techniques, scientific theories, economic theories, economic organizations. I accept all that to the extent it is good for India. It is for us to choose. I do not rule out any-thing but I rule out being uprooted from India'.

What is ordinarily ment by 'Socialism' is collective farming, the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production and State Industrialization. Merely saying that the land should go to the tiller and carrying out that by legislation is simply robbing one person to benefit another. It is a long way off from that to socialist farming which would make the tiller a landless worker on the collective farm.

It is often said that ours is a 'Welfare State' and that what is aimed at is 'a socialistic pattern of society'. The Constitution does not employ these very words. But Art. 38 appears in substance to mean that India would be a Welfare State, as it provides 'The State shall *strive to promote the welfare of the people* by securing and protecting as effectively as it may a social order in which justice, social, economic, political, shall inform all the institutions of the national life.' In the report of the Planning Commission on the 2nd Five Year Plan (which was accepted by the Government) the meaning of 'socialistic pattern of society' is set out as follows :[2644]

The task before an underdeveloped country is not merely to get better results within the existing framework of economic and social institutions, but to mould and refashion these so that they contribute effectively to the realisation of wider and deeper social values. These values or basic objectives have recently been summed up in the phrase 'socialist pattern of society'. Essentially this means 'that the basic criterion for determining the lines of advance must not be private profit, but social gain and that the pattern of development and the structure of socio-economic relation should be so planned that they result not only in appreciable increase of national income and employment but also in greater equality in incomes and wealth.' 'Major decisions regarding production, distribution, consumption and investment

---

2644. Vide p. 9 of a draft outline of the 2nd Five Year Plan pub. by the Planning Commission in February 1956.

must be made by agencies informed by social purpose. The benefits of economic development must accrue more and more to the relatively less privileged classes of society and there should be progressive reduction of the concentration of incomes, wealth and economic power. The problem is to create a *milieu* in which the small man who has so far had little opportunity of perceiving and participating in the immense possibilities of growth through organized effort is enabled to put in his best in the interest of a higher standard of life for himself and increased prosperity for the country'. It appears from this and from what follows that 'socialist pattern of society' is not to be regarded as some rigid or fixed pattern. It is not rooted in any doctrine or dogma.

A booklet published by Sriman Narayan for the All India Congress Committee (2nd ed. of 1956, New Delhi) embodies the notable speeches of the Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He starts by saying that private enterprise is useful so far as our country is concerned, that we wish to encourage it, but the dominance which private enterprise had throughout the world during a certain period is no more and that for a planner it has now a secondary place. Later on (p. 2) he states that he uses the word 'socialistic picture of society' *as meaning largely that the means of production should be socially owned or controlled for the benefit of society as a whole.* On p. 12 he says (at Avadi Session) 'we have laid down that certain basic industries must necessarily be state-owned and there are other industries we should try to encourage the State to start. The plan is an integrated whole and in that integrated whole the public and private sector must also be integrated. They are not rival shows.' On p. 19 he says '*The national aim is a welfare state and a socialistic economy.*' 'Finance is important, but not so much as people think.' 'What is important is trained personnel. The only thing we have to guard against is inflation. Inflation is avoided if there is production corresponding to the money thrown in'. (p. 20). 'Everyone in the country should have the primary things of life like food, clothing, housing, education, sanitation, medical help, employment, work' (p. 27). 'The objectives of India's Planning should be socialistic pattern of society. It cannot be achieved by mere legislation; but it is all a question of planning' (pp. 30-31). 'Both Congress and Parliament have said that we want a socialistic pattern of society. *Why have we used this vague language? We have done*

so deliberately because we do not want to commit ourselves to any rigid formula' (p. 55). 'India wants a social revolution by peaceful means, peaceful methods, by mutual agreement, by working together. Hard work is the only way to progress.' Russia had to use force to do in 20 or 25 years what England did in 100 years (pp. 60–66).

These quotations taken from the speeches of the Prime Minister clearly establish that he does not want a totalitarian communism in India. He appears to favour a democratic socialistic pattern. But he himself admits that vague language about socialistic pattern has been deliberately used and that his idea is to build up in India by trial and error a sort of democratic socialism. But there is great danger in this. The present author is not aware of any large country in the world where a democratic socialistic pattern purposely clothed in vague language has been tried and succeeded. The language being vague and no defininite procedure being chalked out, a socialistic pattern would mean all things to all men and the socialistic pattern of society is vague enough to allow diverse interpretations.

Russia and China have been and are under totalitarian socialism. In Soviet Russia under Lenin and Stalin peasants, working men and intellectuals became statesmen and military commanders, the old economic principle of supply and demand was replaced by central control of all commercial relations, of all production and distribution among the large populations of Russia spread over vast areas, individualistic agriculture gave place to huge co-operative farms managed under the directives of the State, aristocracy and democracy were abolished and dictatorship of a party that monopolized all power emerged. Our leaders appear to have borrowed the ideas of co-operative farming and the State control of production and distribution of several commodities from the Russian example, but the present writer is afraid that without the coercive methods employed by dictators like Stalin, our experiments will not in a measurable period of time lead to the results desired and expected by our leaders.

Those interested in democratic socialism may profitably read Shri Ashok Mehta's work on it (published by Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1959).

What appears to the present author is that our country is to have a mixed economy, in which private and public enterprise are supposed to work together to narrow the disparity or gulf between a small minority of haves and a vast multitude of have-nots. For example, Atomic energy, Railways, iron and steel, aircraft, ship-building are among Government industries, while the private sector is to be concerned with the manufacture of textiles, cement, alluminium, machine tools, chemicals and pharmaceuticals &c.

The present writer does not think that he is competent enough to criticize the means and methods that are being adopted by the leaders of the country and to say whether they are enough to meet the high promises made and the hopes raised by certain Articles in the Constitution such as 39 (part *a* of which declares that the citizens have the *right* to an adequate means of livelihood), 41 (providing for securing the *right to work*, to *education* and to *public assistance* in *cases of un-employment, old age, sickness* and *disablement*), 43 (the State *shall* endeavour to secure to all workers, agricultural, industrial or otherwise, *work*, *a living wage*, *decent standard of life* and full enjoyment of leisure and social and cultural opportunities); vide Articles 45 and 47 already quoted above (on pp. 1669, 1675)

But he will say a few words. The mass of people cannot be kept at a high level of self-sacrifice, great ideals and hard work for long. A dynamic and revered leader like Buddha may succeed for a time in securing this. But, when he passes away, there is gradually a relapse into conditions worse than what they were before. For the vast majority of people anywhere private gain is the chief motive for hard work and not mere requests or sermons. If that motive is abolished, then the majority will not work hard at all, though a few individuals of high ideals and moral character may work as hard as before. Or there will have to be a dictatorship, coercion and fear of being liquidated. In the absence of these, production will be enormously reduced and there will be no improvement in standards of living. Russia and China are not under a Parliamentary democracy and they can therefore make people work without trammels, but in countries like U. K., U. S. A., even Japan the appeal of the motive of private gain is the chief factor. Even in Russia incentives have to be held out for extra work and it is admitted that even after forty years of totalitarian rule, there are great inequalities of income, since the wages of

an Academician and an average worker are in the ratio of 62:1, and (apart from academicians) the wages of high-placed executives and common men are in the ratio of 20:1 and there are no ceilings on income.[2646] Shri Vinoba Bhave placed his target about Bhūmidāna at fifty million acres but he got only about five million acres, half of which are not arable. Now the emphasis has shifted to 'Sarvodaya'. Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, who was first a Marxist out and out, then joined the P. S. Party, is now advocating the principles of 'Sarvodaya' in[2647] 'Towards a new society' published by Mr. Prabhakar Padhye for the Congress for cultural freedom (New Delhi, 1958). Sarvodaya planning seems to be based on the assumption that a radical change in human behaviour and attitude to work and property will take place on a large scale without coercion. There is hardly any basis for any such assumption at present. The Prime Minister himself admits (vide p. 240 of Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao's paper in 'Changing India') that adequate motives and inducements have to be provided. The Indian Government more than any other purely democratic country in the world has extended the scope of public administration to embark on the production and distribution of economic goods while keeping at the same time full Parliamentary democracy. Gandhiji also called upon the millionaires to hold their vast fortunes in trusteeship. One should like to know the names of even a dozen millionaires in India that dealt with their wealth like trustees even in Gandhiji's lifetime.

Let us now turn to the third Five Year Plan.[2648] The vital

2646. Vide 'The Democratic alternative' (p. 16) by Miss M. A. Devaki, published in 1959 by the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, Bombay.

2647. Sarvodaya ideal is not different from the well-known verse 'सर्वेऽत्र सुखिनः सन्तु सर्वे सन्तु निरामयाः । सर्वे भद्राणि पश्यन्तु मा कश्चिद् दुःखमाप्नुयात् ॥,' which means 'May all here (in this world) be happy, may all be free from diseases. May all see prosperity and may no one experience sorrow'.

2648. 'Third Five Year Plan', published by the Government of India, Planning Commission, 1961 (774 pages). While these pages were passing through the press the author came across a book called 'Planning in India' by Mr. V. T. Krishnamachari (Orient Longmans, 1961) who was a member of the Planning Commission from March 1950 and Deputy Chairman from February 1953 to June 1960. It is a valuable book based on official information and containing numerous tables and details. It requires to be carefully studied and invites criticism, but that cannot be done in this place now.

objectives of the planners are stated on p. J. 'Rapid economic growth and expansion of employment, reduction of disparities in income and wealth, prevention of the concentration of economic power, and creation of the values and attitudes of a free and equal society. Where the bulk of the people live so close to the margin of poverty, the claims of social justice, the right to work, of equal opportunity and of a minimum level of living have great urgency'. On p. 48 the principal aims are further elaborated and it is stated on p. 49 that the first priority belongs to agriculture and therefore the total outlay provided is 1718 crores of rupees as against 950 crores in the Second Plan and fertilizers to the extent of 800,000 tons are provided for as against 110,000 tons in the 2nd Plan.

Our country's great handicap is population and food production. Statistics for the growth of population [2649] are '(in millions): 1901 (235.5), 1911 (249), 1921 (248.1), 1931 (275.5), 1941 (314.8), 1951 (356.9), 1961 (438). This indicates that by about 1966–1967 the population of our country may be about 480 millions. Article 39a (referred to on p. 1666) requires the State to direct its policy towards securing that every citizen has the right to an adequate means of livelihood. Our country has been an agricultural country from time immemorial, yet we have to import millions of tons of wheat and other grain for feeding our large population. The finance minister in his speech on the Budget for 1961–62 states (p. 79 para 36) that in May 1961 an agreement under P. L. 480 was signed by India's minister with the U. S. A. for the import in four years of 18 million tons of wheat, one million tons of rice and also certain quantities of maize, cotton, tobacco and soya bean oil. This is the biggest agricultural commodities agreement ever signed between two countries. There were four previous agreements commencing from August 1956 but they were all on a lesser scale. The fifth agreement of May 1960 was for agricultural commodities worth 1369.8 million dollars (= 655.8 crores of rupees). The average intake of food in India is below the nutritional standards laid down by scientists. Ours is one of the poorest countries in the world as the following table [2650] for national income *per capita* for 1957 will show:

2649. Vide Tata Industries 'Statistical Outline of India for 1959', Table 8 for population.

2650. Vide Tata Industries 'Statistical outline of India' 1959, Table No. 2. Vide 'Communist China today' by S. Chandrasekhara (p. 136), who shows that the present figures about China are not reliable owing to a change of policy in modern China.

Country	Rupees	Country	Rupees
India	289	Italy	1922
Australia	5114	Japan	1200
Burma	222	U. K.	4561
Canada	4946	U. S. A.	10124
Ceylon	553	W. Germany	3530

These figures show that in Ceylon the per capita income is double that of India, in Japan it is four times as much and in Germany over twelve times that of India. Both Germany and Japan were devastated by the 2nd World War and yet the people of both countries have in less than 15 years improved so much in production that both are giving substantial assistance to India. Our people and leaders should deeply ponder over this state of things and should strain every nerve in an all out effort to improve the country's lot instead of talking and mutual bickerings.

While these pages were passing through the Press, the author got a copy of 'India 's Food Crisis and steps to meet it" which is a report (of 254 pages) made in 1959 by a Ford Foundation Team of thirteen American Technicians and agriculturist specialists at the invitation of two Indian Ministers of Food and Agriculture and Community Development and co-operation. It is a very important document, discusses seventy aspects of the problem and deserves close study by all Indians interested in India's welfare. It is issued by the Govt. of India. One or two striking matters can alone be referred to here. The report points out that the total population of India will be about 480 millions at the end of the Third Five Plan in 1966, that the target of 110 million tons of food grains by 1965–66 is reasonable and is necessary to provide food enough for the added millions and to provide for some dietary improvement and a safety margin for poor crops and other emergencies. The report recognises that India is making steady progress in food production, but the rate of production must be tripled to meet the Third Plan target. It gives the warning that if India's food production increases no faster than at present rates, the *gap*

between supplies and target will be 28 million tons by 1965–66; *this would be 25 per cent shortfall in terms of need and that no* conceivable programme of imports or rationing would meet a crisis of this magnitude (pp. 3–4). The report suggests several emergency measures and measures to be carried on over a long period, which cannot be set out here. It stresses the need for research in agricultural economics. It recommends (p. 11) that the entire nation must be made aware of the impending food crisis and steps must be taken to meet it and warns that adequate supplies of food are essential to the survival of democracy. Two short-comings of the report may be pointed out. It does not tell us what funds would be required for research and for implementing the numerous other suggestions it makes. Besides, it says nothing about the birth rate in India and measures to curb the phenomenal rise in population.

According to U. N. Demographic Year book (August 1960) there are about 2900 million people in the world. More than half of the world's inhabitants live in four countries viz. China (669 millions), India (438 millions), Soviet Union (209 millions), U. S. A. (178 millions). Population growth depends upon the birth rate and the death rate. Owing to scientific discoveries, epidemics or such diseases as malaria, typhoid, cholera, influenza are either eliminated or brought under control and therefore the death rate tends to be lower and lower. It is the birth rate that has to be controlled. The following table[2651] for comparative birth rate and death rate in 1957 for eight countries is interesting:

Country	Birth Rate per thousand.	Death rate per thousand.
India	24	12
Australia	23	9
Canada	28	8
Ceylon	37	10
France	19	12
Sweden	15	10
U. K.	17	12
U. S. A.	25	10

2651. Vide table 12 'Comparative vital statistics, 1957' in the Tata Industries' Statistical Outline of India, 1959'.

This table shows that the birth rate in our country is not very high or abnormal and the death rate is also similar to that of such progressive countries as France and U. K. Many Western countries have no definite population policy at Govt. level. But the case of our country is entirely different. Our country has already a huge population, most of which is on the margin of subsistence level. Supposing that by means of our two Five Year Plans the national income in the ten years (1951–1961) increased 30 percent, the growth of population in the same period would come to about 22 percent, so that most of the additional wealth produced would be eaten up by the new mouths that have to be fed and the standard of living of the average Indian would practically remain the same. Therefore, the main problem that faces the Government, the planners and the people is how to control the large growth of population. Population control will not solve all the problems of our country, but our other problems will not be solved without solving that problem. The Government of India and the Planners had no well thought policy about the control of population. Government appears to lay far more emphasis on industrialization and agricultural production than on population control. In the first Five Year Plan only 65 lakhs of rupees were allocated to the schemes of population control, in the 2nd Five Year Plan the allocation was raised to five crores. The Planning Commission has now realized the gravity of the problem of the enormous growth of Indian population, has provided 50 crores of rupees in the Third Plan for the various schemes of population control (vide pp. 676 ff. of Third Five Year Plan). In the whole world about 100 people are born every minute, about 6000 persons every hour, about 140,000 every day and about five crores every year. This problem of the phenomenal growth of population overshadows in urgency and importance almost every problem of the contemporary world, much more so of India. Very little is being done to control systematically the terrific growth of numbers. Sweden in the early 19th century was a poverty-stricken country, but now it is one of the progressive and prosperous countries of the world owing to hard work, co-operation, honesty, social and personal discipline. Birth control is a very difficult and delicate problem. Religious beliefs and prejudices have to be taken into consideration. In Ṛgvedic times the prayer to God Indra for a newly married bride had been 'O bountiful Indra! may ten sons be born of her and make her husband the eleventh (member of the family).' Later on

some kindly soul took compassion on women and made the blessing to be 'of eight sons'. The Mahābhārata said that a sonless man does not reach blessed worlds (heaven &c). By the birth of a son the father was deemed to have discharged his debt to his ancestors and the water and piṇḍas (balls of cooked rice) offered by the son to his deceased father and other deceased ancestors were supposed to be of great efficacy for the peace of the departed souls. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 560-61, 799 and above p. 1626 This importance of a son or sons is believed to this day by almost all illiterate or educated people in India except a few men and women of advanced views. Educated brides sometimes request that the old mode of blessing for eight sons should not be followed. Therefore, in such cases the formula has to be changed to 'may you have as many sons as you desire'. The Smṛtis lay down that the husband has to cohabit with the wife after the first few days of her monthly illness and that he incurred the sin of embryo murder if he refused to do so without good cause. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. II pp. 570–71 and note 1327. The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Chap. 14. 5-6) goes a little further and gives a story in which the husband who neglected this owing to his partiality for another charming wife had to undergo torments of hell. The present high prices of the necessaries of life induce many people to limit families by various devices. The Planning Commission is going to try various measures such as intensive education, provision of facilities and advice on the largest scale possible, providing family planning services at 1864 rural and 330 urban medical and health centres, numbers of sterilization centres, opening 6100 clinics in rural areas and 2100 in urban areas (in 2nd Plan only 549 urban and 1100 rural clinics), distribution of simple contraceptives, research programme for more effective contraceptives etc. The 3rd Plan reports that in the 2nd Plan period 125000 sterilization operations were carried out (p. 678 of Third Plan). The present author is not an expert in these matters and so will content himself by pointing out that sterilization and, particularly contraceptives, are double-edged weapons. Sterilization for males is easy and may become popular among well-to-do men for selfish reasons (such as not wanting children and not undertaking the task of bringing them up). Therefore, a rule would have to be made and rigorously enforced that no sterilization will be done unless the man has three children or more. Vide a very thoughtful work 'Fertility and Survival' by Alfred Sauvy tr. from French by hristine Brooke-Rose (1961). Birth control is practised in

West Europe, North America, Japan exclusively by the well-to-do type of people. The same might happen in India. The most serious objection against contraceptives is that they will lead to immorality and encourage promiscuity in both sexes. Gandhiji in his 'Self-restraint versus self-indulgence' (3rd. ed., 1928) stated that so far as India is concerned there is no case for contraceptives (p. 3) and advised self-restraint. But he might have changed his opinion if he had been alive today. To advise poor people to practise self restraint, when most of them live in hovels of one room or two rooms, who are uneducated and have no ambitions and pass life in abject poverty, sounds to them as a huge joke. The well-to-do have many interests in life and several outlets for their energy but for the poor there are very few. It is interesting to note that the Prime Minister in his 'Autobiography' (1936) strongly criticizes Gandhiji's praise of poverty, suffering and ascetic life as utterly wrong, harmful and impossible of achievement (p. 510) and regards Gandhiji's attitude to sex as extraordinary (p. 512).

Dr. Radhakrishnan in 'Religion and Society' (published in 1947) concedes (p. 189) that the use of contraceptives cannot be altogether forbidden, quotes Dawson to the effect that birth control by abstention is either ineffective or, if effective, pernicious (p. 90), that objections to birth control by contraceptives are due to their abuse and that in the present conditions facilities for birth control must be available, especially to poorer classes (p. 191). Contraceptives would have to be harmless to use, cheap, easy to use and absolutely reliable. The author is not sure if there are contraceptives of this type. Japan, a small country of islands, was compelled by the rapid growth of population to legalise abortions. Vide 'Aggression and Population' by F. James Dawson (London, 1946) for a thoughtful book on how to check worldwide growth of population. A thoughtful and exhaustive work is 'Population and planned parenthood in India' by S. Chandrasekhar, Director of Indian Institute for population studies, Madras (revised Edition of 1961).

The total investment programme for the Third Plan comes to Rs. 10400 crores (p. 109), Rs. 6100 crores in the public sector and Rs. 4300 crores in the private sector. The public sector has to find Rs. 7500 crores in all (that is Rs. 6300 for investment plus 1200 crores for current outlays in personnel &c (p. 91).

Resources for the Third Plan (p. 100)

TABLE 3.

	CENTRE	STATES	TOTAL
1. Balance from current revenue	410	140	550
2. Contribution of Railways	100	...	100
3. Surpluses of other public enterprises	300	150	450
4. Loans from the public	475	325	800
5. Small Savings	213	387	600
6. Provident funds	183	82	265
7. Steel Equalisation Fund	105	...	105
8. Balance of miscellaneous capital receipts.	428	258	170
9. Total of 1 to 8	2214	826	3040
10. Additional Taxation	1100	610	1710
11. External Assistance	2200	...	2200
12. Deficit financing	524	26	550
Total ...	6038	1462	7500

Besides the States have resources for 3rd Plan amounting to 1416 crores.

The two five year plans have given our leaders a certain mastery over the situation and some confidence abut the future. But Mr. Nanda has to admit that the productivity and level of efficiency ase very low. Foreign aid raises difficult questions as to how to match it with an adequate mobilization of domestic resources. The mass of people are poverty-stricken, have a low standard of living and therefore can save little. High prices, which is a concomitant of development plans in all countries, are making common people discontented.

Foreign assistance runs into thousands of crores of rupees, nearly half of which comes from U. S. A. The United States Information Service has prepared a detailed statement of assistance to India for ten years from June 1951 to 4th August 1961 and circulated it to many Indians from which some striking figures are quoted here. A statement brought up only to June 30 of 1961 gives slightly smaller numbers as compared with the statement given below which brings up the figures up to 4th August 1961,

U. S. Government aid consists of grants and loans. Grants are gifts and do not involve any repayment. The grants in ten years total 1128.5 million dollars (537.4 crores of rupees). Loans involve repayment, some in dollars and some in rupees or dollars at the option of the Indian Government. Repayment in rupees does not involve the utilization of India's foreign exchange earnings or the export of goods from India. Eighty percent of U. S. loans to India up to Aug. 4, 1961 (2192.1 million dollars) are repayable in rupees i. e. that portion of the loans is not so inconvenient as the loans repayable in dollars are.

On p. 110 of Third Five Year Plan the foreign exchange requirements are put down at 2030 crores of Rs. for plan projects. But there are other general needs of the economy by way of raw materials, components, replacement machinery to be provided for. It is estimated that Rs. 3800 crores over the five years would be not too high. On p. 114 it is stated that the total assistance for the Third Plan assured by foreign countries is 2286 million dollars (Rs. 1089 crores) out of which the USA has agreed to provide 1045 million dollars (just under half of the total foreign assistance), West Germany 425 million dollars, U. K. 250 million dollars, Japan 80 million dollars, and small sums by Canada, France &c.

U. S. Aid from the Inception of the Aid Programme to India in June 1951, through August 4, 1961.

	Dollars (Millions)	Rupees (Crores)
Aid under Indo-American technical co-operative programme	496.4	236.4
Public Law 480, Title I	2337.3	1113.0
Famine Relief grants to Indian Government	10.4	5.0
Agricultural commodities distributed through voluntary agencies (Public Law 480, Title III).	116.8	53.6
Development Loan Fund	513.4	244.5
Export-Import Bank	246.9	117.6
Wheat Loan of 1951	189.7	90.3
Total ...	3910.9	1862.6

BREAKDOWN

Grants to Indian Government for economic development (not repayable)	1128.5	537.4
Famine relief grants to Indian Government (not repayable)	10.4	5.3
Agricultultural commodities distributed through voluntary agencies (PL. 480, title III) (not repayable)	116.8	55.6
Loans repayable in dollars	436.6	307.9
Loans repayable in rupees or dollars	1755.6	836.0
Cooley fund for loans to private enterprises.	162.3	77.3
Amounts under PL-480 Title I reserved for US Govt. use.	300.8	143.1
Total ...	3910.9	1862.6

The preceding table shows that in the last ten years, India has become indebted to the USA in the huge sum of 2655 million dollars (some payable in dollars alone and the rest in rupees if India chose that way). In the Third Plan USA has agreed to provide India up to 1045 million dollars i. e. at the end of the 15 years from 1951 India may owe to U.S.A. 3700 million dollars, that is roughly about 1756 crores of rupees (at Rs. 4¾ per dollar). India will probably owe a larger amount to all the other lending countries taken together. The most serious question is how and in how many years India will repay the debts that run into astronomical figures. The explanatory memorandum accompanying the Central Budget for 1961-62 shows that India's public debt stood at Rs. 949 crores on 31st March 1939. On the 31st March 1962 it will reach the huge figure of 5554 crores. Adding the liability of Govt. to repay various deposits placed with Govt. under the Post Office Savings Bank, National Plan Savings, Provident Funds, Saving Deposit Certificates etc. which account for Rs. 1868 crores, India's obligations would really come to 7422 crores of Rs. (5554+1868), at the end of March 1962. Our interest yielding assets are only Rs. 5725 crores. If we add to this huge sum the debts our Govt. will owe to U. S. A. and other countries as shown in the

above table, at the end of the third plan India would be indebted in the colossal figure of about Rs. 11000 crores.

While these pages were passing through the Press, the author received a statement from the USA Information Service in Bombay, which brings the figures up to 12th March 1962. It states that the American Economic assistance to India from June 1951 to 12th March 1962 totals 4118 million dollars (= 1960.9 crores of Rupees) as shown in the table below :

		DOLLARS (Million)	RUPEES (Crores)	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
1.	Grant (not repayable)	1,291.2	614.8	31.3
2.	Loans repayable in dollars.	608.2	289.6	14.8
3.	Local Currency repayments.	2,218	1,056.5	53.9
		4,118.0	1,960.9	100.0

It is not necessary to go into other details. The loans are repayable at different dates, some being repayable in forty years and some carrying a very low rate of interest. It may, however, be noted that out of about 4000 million dollars aid to India since Independence over half has been in the form of P. L. 480 Food for commodities. The Food Minister of India, Mr. S. K. Patil, assures us, however, that India would become completely self-sufficient in food by the end of the Third Five Year Plan and points out that during the last decade, foodgrain production in India rose from 50 to 80 million tons a year, an increase of 60 per cent. But it should not be forgotten that the population of India in the same ten years increased by about 22 per cent over the population in 1951.

The Welfare State theoretically aims at (Sarvodaya) prosperity for all (at least for the vast majority). Up to recent times, the main obligations of the State towards its people were the administration of the country, the defence of the country and its coast against aggression or invasion, maintenance of law and order, primary and higher education. The ambition of the framers of the Indian Constitution and our leaders is to create a welfare state, and to reconstruct the present social and economic order on a socialistic pattern by subjecting the country to a planned economy. Several vital industries are now reserved

for the State and Government has assumed power to regulate production, to control distribution and to fix even the prices of some commodities absolutely necessary to all men in daily life. It has also established the State Trading Corporation. Taxation has become an ever-increasing instrument of economic policy for carrying out the plan projects. Apart from the income-Tax Act (XI of 1922 recently consolidated by Act 43 of 1961) our democratic Government passed one after another four Acts, viz. the Estate Duty Act (XXXIV of 1953), the Wealth Tax (XXVI of 1957), the Expenditure Tax (XXIX of 1957) and the Gift Tax (XVIII of 1958). There is no other country in the world that has all the above five taxes. Is India the only welfare country in the world? There is a sense of uncertainty and fright in the middle classes and tax dodging in the rich or influential sections of the community. Reasons of space prevent the citing of illustrations of the arbitrary character of the recent four Acts. In all these Acts the opinions of the Govt. officers (viz. Gift Tax officer, expenditure tax officer, and wealth tax officer and higher officers) in an executive ladder under the same Acts on questions of fact (such as the value of a property) are final and cannot be questioned in any court of justice (i. e. in a subordinate judge's court or district judge's court or High Court). If a creditor releases a debtor from his debts (wholly or partly) the creditor will have to pay gift tax on the debt released if the gift tax officer is of opinion that he could have recovered the debt by means of legal steps. No man can make a gift of more than 100 rupees at one time to a private person or even a near relative (except to his wife) and if he makes several gifts to the same person in one year exceeding five hundred rupees he will have to pay gift tax. In all cases of questions of fact one appeal should have been allowed to a district court or where the amount concerned was more than ten thousand rupees to the High Court. It should be recognized by policy-makers that our people have great faith in the integrity of the High Courts and the district judges who are selected by the High Courts and whose promotion does not depend on the Executive. They have not much faith in the fairness and integrity of Appellate Commissioners and Tribunals that are appointed by the Ministers, when the dispute is between private persons and taxing authorities on behalf of Government. Writers on the constitutions of countries have for many years emphasized two leading features viz. the sovereignty of Parliament and the rule of law. Parliaments are cajoled into

passing legislation whereby courts of justice are evaded or passed by and the will or caprice of executive officers becomes unfettered and supreme. This is what is called the 'New Despotism' by Lord Chief Justice Hewart of Great Britain.[2559] In the name of the Welfare State it seems that all power is being centralized in bureaucracy by our leaders.

Most common pepople in India have a very vague notion of what socialism means. They believe that socialism is based on Marxism.[2652] Marx holds that revolution is the weapon or means by which the workers are to seize power, that his theory is scientific and based on a study of facts. He himself declared that he was no 'Marxist' (vide 'Naked God' p. 3 by Howard Fast, New York, 1957 and 'New Class' by Milovan Djilas p. 4 London, 5th Impression, 1958). These words of his are explained by Dr. Radhakrishnan as meaning that he was not pledged to the acceptance of a doctrine, final, complete and oppressive (vide 'Religion and Society,' 1947, p. 25). This is not the place to discuss the premises and predictions of Marx. But a few words may be said here. Marx had predicted that communism would prevail first in the most developed and industrialized nations. What happened is quite the opposite of this. Communism occurred in countries like Russia and China that were relatively very much less developed and industrialized. Another of his predictions was that the system of private ownership would make the rich richer and the poor poorer, would

---

2652. Vide 'New Despotism' by Lord Chief Justice Hewart (Earnest Benn Ltd. London, 1929) p. 17 (a long passage from which is quoted by R. S. W. Pollard in 'Conscience and liberty' (Allen and Unwin, London, 1940). Vide also 'Bureaucracy triumphant' by C. K. Allen (London, 1931). All these taxing enactments have created a high ladder of officers appointed by the executive. For example, under the Wealth Tax Act there is first the Wealth Tax Officer who decides what tax is payable, then there is an appeal to the Appellate Assistant Commissioner (Sec. 23), then there is a further appeal to the Appellate Tribunal (Sec. 24), then there can be a reference to the High Court on a point of law (Sec. 27-28) and finally an appeal to the Supreme Court (Sec. 29). This is sheer harassment and practical denial of justice. After a private person has run to three different officers or official bodies then only the High Court comes in, if at all, and that too on a point of law. It should be remembered that the wealth tax officer has often to determine the value of properties worth lakhs of rupees and on points of fact there are appeals only to the first officer's superiors and there is no provision for a probe of facts by a court or judicial officer independent of the executive. A similar procedure is provided in the Gift Tax, the Expenditure Tax and Estate Duty Tax.

breed ruinous depressions and in the end the angry proletariat would revolt, would overthrow the exploiting classes and establish a communist society. This second prophecy has not materialized in almost all highly industrialized nations. On the contrary, several democratic States have provided security against unemployment, sickness and old age and in some countries employers have admitted representatives of workers into the management of industries. The 'Communist Manifesto' is the official Bible in the U. S. S. R. A recent work 'The 'Anatomy of the Soviet man' by Claus Mehnert, translated from German by Maurice Rosenbaum (1961), appears to the present author to contain a balanced and fair estimate of the working of Communism in U. S. S. R. He points out that the desire to *rise socially and amass wealth and power is as common to the* Soviet Union as to the rest of the world (p. 84), that the New Class does not constitute a *bourgeoisie* in the West European sense, that it is a State *bourgeoisie*, all members work for the State and are dependent on it (p. 73), that social distinctions are greater in U. S. S. R. than in U. S. A. (p. 109), that the greatest disproportion prevails between the incomes of Academicians, artists and writers on the one hand and ordinary men and workers on the other. It appears to the present author that Communism has so far been the best means for the exploitation of the proletariat.

No great Indian leader of the present day has offered a lucid and considered statement of what the philosophical foundations of Indian socialism are or should be, nor has any leader placed before the people a clear and full picture of the Indian socialistic pattern of the future in all its aspects. In the Plan structures welfare seems to be identified with bread, physical and material comforts. Marx denied God and advocated the forcible liquidation of the exploiting classes. Our Constitution does not mention God (except in schedule III about oaths and affirmations of Ministers and M. P.'s) nor does it emphasize moral and spiritual values, though the founding fathers of the U.S.A. prescribe (in the Declaration of American Independence) " All men are created equal. They are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights ; among them are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness ". Of course it is wrong and unscientific to say that all men are created equal if literally construed (as even children of the same parents are not equal in height, strength and mental equipment). All that is meant is that all men are equal in the eye of the law or have the same rights before the law. Truth

and non-violence are not mentioned in our Constitution, though these were the basic principles from Upaniṣad and Smṛti times (as in Chāndogya III. 17.4, Manu X. 63, Yāj. I. 122) and for Gandhiji by whom all Congressmen and their leaders swear. Lands of thousands of men of the middle class of small means were taken away from them by changing the fundamental right to property bestowed by Art. 31 (as originally enacted), by preventing recourse to law courts and by giving illusory hopes of some compensation not yet even determined after several years. This may not be liquidation of opponents, yet it is a cruel thing all the same in the name of democracy and Welfare State.[2653]

Borrowing in the country itself and from foreign countries has been resorted to on an increasing scale.

Table 3 above (p. 1689–90) will convey some idea of the vast amounts of debts our country owes and will owe to U. S. A. and other countries. How and in how many years the nation will be able to pay back these debts with interest is to ordinary men a source of grave anxiety and an insoluble problem. Among the sources for the plan are included Provident Funds, Post Office savings bank accounts, National Plan Certificates &c. These are really debts, though not demandable on any one date or year. Deficit financing which did not form part of the central budget in past years has now become a regular item. The budget of the central Govt. for 1961–62 exceeds 1023 crores. For 1962-63 the revenues are estimated at 1329.87 crores of

2653. Vide a book called 'Social Welfare in India' issued on behalf of the Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, 1960. People are likely to make a confusion between 'Welfare State' and 'Social Welfare'. The latter phrase refers to more specialized work for the weak or more vulnerable sections of the population (such as women, children, physically handicapped persons like the deaf, dumb and blind, mentally retarded, scheduled castes and tribes and backward classes). A Welfare State wants to change the pattern of life of the whole community or country. Our Constitution in Article 15 (paragraphs 3 and 4) authorizes the State to make special provisions for women and children and for the advancement of backward classes, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and Article 16 para 4 authorizes the State to make provision for the reservation of appointments or posts in favour of any backward class of citizens. Articles 338–342 deal with the appointment of a special officer for the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and with the appointment by the President of India of a Commission to report on the administration of scheduled areas and scheduled tribes and for specification from time to time of the castes, races or tribes in a list of the scheduled castes and tribes.

rupees and the expenditure at 1381.65 crores of rupees and it is announced that a total deficit of about 150 crores would have to be met partly by additional taxation of 60 crores and 80 lakhs of rupees. It must be remembered that most of these taxes are indirect and the major part of the income from such taxes is due to levies on articles of everyday necessity to common people who are already groaning under high prices of absolutely necessary commodities. The Bombay Government's Budget for 1962–63 intended to tax the poor man's *bidis* and *gur* (jaggery). About 7000 crores were put in the State sector in the 1st and 2nd Plan projects and 7500 crores are proposed to be spent in the Public sector in the 3rd plan period. Thus at the end of the 3rd Plan (in 1965–66) Government will have spent about 15000 crores of rupees. Tremendous power will be concentrated in the hands of ministers and the official bureaucracy. It is not generally known how Government has dealt with or will deal with this vast amount, what projects have been undertaken, which of them are completed, the cost of the completed projects, yearly yield from the projects that are completed, steps that are being taken to repay debts and to what extent. There are fervent appeals made by leaders to common people to co-operate with Govt. but the Govt. does not seem to be anxious to take people into confidence by widely circulating through newspapers, press-notes or otherwise information on the above mentioned matters. The vast sums spent on projects have caused inflation. Besides, during the two five year Plans population increased by 77 millions. This accentuated the problem of unemployment and on p. 47 of the book above referred to it is admitted that at the end of 10 years the backlog of unemployment is estimated at nine millions.

Sir W. Beveridge in 'Pillars of Security' (1944) names five giants with which humanity has to struggle viz. want, disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness. (p. 43) The last, that is, unemployment, should be the first point of attack. Art. 41 of our Constitution confers the right to work, to education and to public assistance in case of unemployment, old age, sickness and in certain other cases. It is not easy to give full employment for all. The State must try to limit numbers and provide not merely for literary education but also for vocational and technical training on a very extensive scale. Industrialization is necessary but it is not an unmixed blessing. Discussion of these matters would require far more space than can be afforded in this chapter.

One last word before taking leave of the subjects of Democracy, Welfare State, Socialistic pattern, legislation, planning for social and economic reconstruction. In the new set-up public administrators have become the brains behind the production of economic goods. They have, however, to do in the new sphere work which is entirely different from their traditional work in the Government of former times. Production activity in modern days demands bringing together and co-ordinating various skills and complex tasks to which administrators in Govt. offices are often strangers. How far they will be able to accomplish the new tasks undertaken by them is a matter which admits of no certain answer. But the most perplexing and baffling question is : Can all-comprehensive national plans under which the State either owns or controls most aspects of economic activities in Agriculture, Industry and Trade be implemented democratically by Parliamentary control ? The present author is very much afraid that the combination of economic and political power in the hands of a few ministers, high ranking officials and politicians would be so overpowering as to reduce the present Parliament (based on universal adult suffrage, only 23 percent of the population being literate) to a mere shadow and may in some respects at least narrow the liberties of men almost as much as the totalitarian State does.

Let us now turn to the reform and reorganization of Hindu Society and religion. The Portuguese came to India towards the end of the 15th century and acquired some territory on the Western coast of India. But owing to religious intolerance and persecution by them not much impression was made by them on Hindu society. But the case was different with the British, who did not imitate the Portuguese in the matter of religion, but wanted trade, wealth and power. On account of the British rule established over a large part of India from 1765 A. D. Indians came in contact with modern English literature and modern science. The earliest Indian reformer in modern times was a Bengali, Raja Ram Mohan Roy (1772-1833). He founded the Brāhmo Samāja in 1828. Some of the great names in the effort to reorganize and reform Hindu society and religion are those of Devendranath Tagore (1817-1905), Keshub Chandra Sen (1838-1884), Ishvarachandra Vidyasagar, Dayānand (1824-1883) who founded the Āryasamāja in 1877 and who regarded only the Vedas as authoritative, Rāmakrishna Paramahaṁsa (1834-1886) and his great disciple Swami Vivekānanda (1863-1902), who founded the Ramkrishna Mission

for propagating Vedānta and doing charity work among the poor and the needy, M. G. Ranade (1842–1901) who was closely connected with the Prārthanāsamāja of Bombay, Agarkar, Phule, Rabindranath Tagore (1861–1941), Gandhiji (1869–1948), Dr. Karve (who founded the Women's University in 1916). Those interested may usefully read 'A Century of Social Reform' by S. Natarajan (Asia Publishing House, Bombay), G. N. Farquhar's 'Modern religious movements in India' (Macmillan, 1917), W. T. de Bary's 'Sources of Indian Tradition', New York, 1958 (pp. 604–659).

There is a great ferment of ideas in India at present. Many of our countrymen, whether young or old, do not derive any inspiration from their religion. It is not the fault of religion, but the fault lies with us and our predecessors who did not and do not exhibit to us the core of our culture and religion, do not sift the essentials and separate them from the unessential accretions due to superstitions and wrong emphasis. Ordinary men of to-day feel bewildered by the disagreements between scientific knowledge and the traditional beliefs. The result is that traditional values and codes of conduct are disintegrating and various views are being bandied about. There are now several distinct thought-forms on matters religious or spiritual. One class calls itself *sanātanis* whose view is that the traditional codes of conduct and beliefs were established by the all-wise sages of old and therefore modern half-baked reformers have no right at all to introduce changes in them. There is another class (allied to these) of those who have studied such modern sciences as eugenics and biology, who oppose change on the ground that our traditions embodied in the caste system and the restrictive rules about marriage are most scientific and no change should be made in them and if made disaster will follow. There is another class of people who say 'why do you quarrel with us ? Time will bring about all necessary changes'. There are other people who go to the other extreme and deny the existence of any divine or spiritual realities and values in the world. Some believe in the efficacy of laws to introduce desired changes. There are people who say 'take the essential values of Indian culture as foundation and build thereon a structure in keeping with the needs of the times'. Hinduism has always been growing and changing traditions (vide for examples above pp. 1267–72 and 1471). The changes, however, were not brought about by legislation but were the work of commentators and digest-writers, the result being a bewildering variety of

laws, customs and usages, religious and spiritual views in different parts of India. India, being always divided into many kingdoms before the advent of the British, there did not exist any legislative authority that could pass laws for the whole of India. Ancient and medieval Dharmaśāstra writers held the view that the king had no authority to interfere with Śāstric rules governing *varṇas* and castes. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III pp. 98-101 for the proposition that there was almost total absence of legislative power in the king according to Dharmaśāstra writers. Changes in practices and beliefs, however, did take place, but it was learned commentators that by various devices tried to support changes that had already taken place (vide pp. 1267-1272 above). There are really three well-marked classes of people, viz. *Sanātanis* or no-changers, the iconoclasts and those who want a synthesis of the old and the new.

The question is what should be conserved or discarded from the old practices and what new ideals or values should be added and assimilated. Reasons of space forbid saying much about values here. Values are largely moulded by environment. Only a century or two ago, slavery or racial inequality and pride, sweating children of tender age in factories were accepted in Christian countries as morally neutral or at least not disreputable. But at present some of these, if not all, are generally condemned as immoral. In India also values have changed from time to time. At one time animal sacrifices were quite reputable and of high other-worldly value. Later in the Upaniṣad times *Ahiṁsā* came to the fore. But there are certain values of our culture that have endured for three thousand years, viz. the consciousness that the whole world is the manifestation of the Eternal Essence, restraint of senses, charity and kindness. Now we are in an age of democracy and the important values of democracy are justice, liberty, equality and fraternity. But unfortunately many of those who sing paeans of democracy in India hanker after power and are in the grip of selfishness and hatred. Lord Acton wrote " All power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." Kauṭilya said more than two thousand years ago that power warps (intoxicates) the mind. Vide H. of Dh. vol. III p. 114 and n. 151 for quotations.

Many young men have in these days hardly anything which they believe as worth striving for whatever the cost may be, and hence they have nothing to practise as an ideal. We have to preserve a religious spirit among common men and

women, while getting rid of superstitions and beliefs opposed to all science and common sense. It is not the age-old principles of Hindu religion that are at fault, it is modern Hindu society that has to be reorganized, particularly when ours is now a democratic republic; and our leaders must make supreme efforts for many years to preserve equality in the midst of very great economic inequality, liberty which is likely to be overwhelmed by mighty parties and social groups and democracy against demagogues on the one hand and plutocrats on the other.

We must not shut our eyes to the peculiar and formidable difficulties of our country.[2654] Even the present India (i. e. Bhārat) is a vast country. There are in present India adherents of eight great religious systems (Hindu, Buddhist, Jain, Sikh, Moslem, Parsi, Christianity and Judaism), besides some tribes following none of these, but their own primitive systems; there are different States based on 14 different languages (mentioned in the 8th schedule to the Constitution of India), besides six Union territories and about 200 recognized dialects. These are likely to produce movements towards complete provincial autonomy and cultural separation. There are great contrasts among the inhabitants, at one end the primitive tribes and the people who were untouchables and at the other end highly educated men and, in between the two, groups of illiterate people numbering at present about 77 per cent of the whole population. *After centuries of conquests by alien people our country has gained independence.* This opens

---

2654 For a somewhat captious and depressing portrayal of our difficulties by an apparently unsympathetic and unhelpful critic, vide 'India, the most dangerous decades' by Selig S. Harrison (Oxford University Press, 1960). The trend of the whole book is mainly to drive home one point viz. that democracy will not live or be successful in India. The book, it is believed, is mainly intended for non-Indian readers. The author insists too much on the obscurantist tendencies of some Indian people in the matter of caste. If he felt real sympathy and real friendship for the new democracy in India, he should have emphasized the points that make for unity in India, viz. the absence of an organized Church (like Protestant or the Roman Catholic Church), that Hinduism is a personal religion, that Hindus can easily adapt themselves to the requirements of modern democracy as shown by the three elections held so far without any serious disturbances when there were millions upon millions of voters, men and women. If he really wanted to help the Indian people, he should have stressed matters that favour democracy and not constantly harped on North India and South India, on Hindi and anti-Hindi, many States and language difficulties.

for us a new vista of creative thinking and work. We need not give up the basic principles of Hinduism, but should reorientate them to meet new and more complex conditions and work out a changed social order. Everybody says that what is wanted is an emotional integration of Indians and some have suggested that the caste system should be destroyed. If the caste system were a tangible thing it could have been easily and quickly destroyed. But it is not tangible. Legislation cannot destroy it. Only a change of heart with appropriate remedies and vast efforts persistently made over a long period may accomplish this Herculean task and not glib talk by people that hardly ever practise in their lives what they preach. In the present author's opinion States purely on linguistic basis should not have been created at all, but once it was resolved to create them, that should have been strictly adhered to and clear definite principles should have been laid down by the Central Government about assigning border villages to one State or another. The Central Government leadership has been most vacillating in this respect. For exmple, there were at least five different proposals put forward on Bombay City alone viz. a bilingual state (in which Bombay City was merged), a city State for Bombay alone with separate states of Gujarat and Maharashtra, central administration for five years, a return to the bilingual formula, and lastly separate Maharashtra (including Bombay City, Berar and Marathwada) and a separate State of Gujarat, with about 200 villages taken over from the Khandesh and Thana districts that had been part of Maharashtra for over one hundred years.

The caste system, the joint family system and the laws of succession and inheritance that are peculiar to Hindus are really social matters and not religious matters at all. Our Constitution and recent legislation deal with all the three, holding that these are social matters. As shown above, the Constitution abolished untouchability, the Hindu Marriage Act has done away with all prohibitions against marriages between persons of different castes and a Hindu can have marriage relations with any Hindu (including Buddhist, Jain and Sikh) and can take any Hindu woman as spouse subject only to the rules of *sapiṇḍa* relationship and prohibited degrees for marriage. The Hindu Succession Act has practically done away with the joint family system as shown above, though it has not been expressly abrogated.

What is wanted is not mere declamations against the caste system and fervent appeals for emotional integration of all Indians but a comprehensive code or scheme of beliefs and day to day conduct. The present writer cannot enter here into a detailed code or scheme which might require a volume by itself but some concrete proposals if set out here may induce more competent writers to give better and more exhaustive patterns. Let there be churning of thoughts. It is possible that in the beginning one may meet with formidable and fearful difficulties as in the mythological churning of the ocean, but let us hope that, even after the emergence of frightful things, the final result would be blissful, as in the churning of the ocean poison emerged but the whole effort was crowned with the appearance of *amrta* at the end.

We must not despair of solving our difficult problems. Despair means destruction and death. We must not lose courage by the condition of our country for the last few centuries. We should rather look to our achievements during about three thousand years and take to heart the following advice of ancient sages of the Dharmśāstras such as that of Manu. Manu says (IV.137)[2655] 'one should not despise oneself on account of previous failures; one should seek (make efforts for securing) prosperity till one's death and should not regard prosperity as unattainable.' To the same effect is Yāj. when he says 'One should *never despise* a learned brāhmaṇa, a serpent, a ksatriya (a king) or *oneself*; one should desire to secure prosperity till one's death and should not touch (i. e. make public) another's weak points (misdeeds &c.)' We are over 43 crores of people, we are proud of the achievements of our forefathers. If we work hard in a concerted and intelligent effort for years with the sole object of bringing about the highest development of the country and without ambitions of securing individual profit or fame there is no reason why our country should not outstrip or at least equal other countries in the world. The Īśopaniṣad 2 (Vāj. S. 40.2) ordains for all common men 'one should wish to live for a hundred years, always doing here (in this world) actions (prescribed by the śāstra).' The Ait. Br. (chap. 33.3), in the story of Śunaḥśepa insists on men being always active and emphasizes that prosperity does not come to him who does

---

2655. नात्मानमवमन्येत पूर्वाभिरसमृद्धिभिः । आ मृत्योः श्रियमन्विच्छेन्नैनां मन्येत दुर्लभाम् ॥ मनु. IV. 137; विप्राहिक्षत्रियात्मानो नावज्ञेयाः कदाचन । आ मृत्योः श्रियमाकाङ्क्षेत्र कंचिन्मर्माणि स्पृशेत् ॥ या. I. 153.

not work hard (nānāśrāntāya śrīrastīti). So early as the Ṛgveda (IV. 33.11) it is emphasized that Gods do not befriend anyone who has not become tired by hard work (na ṛte śrāntasya sakhyāya devāḥ).

In 1934 some persons under the guidance of Swāmī Kevalānanda Sarasvatī of Wai (Satara District) started a society which later came to be named 'Dharmanirṇaya-maṇḍala'[2656] (society for arriving at definite conclusions on matters of Dharma). The Swamī was a very learned man and a Sannyāsin, did not know English, but he held very modern views. There were fourteen original founder members of whom the present author is one. From 1934 to 1959 eleven sessions attended by hundreds of people were held at Thana, Poona (twice), Lonavla (thrice), Ahmednagar, Badalapur (Dist. Thana), Vardhā (in Berar), Akolā (in Berar), Wai and Bombay. At the different sessions resolutions were passed (in all 82) on several social and religious matters and a committee was appointed to prepare model *prayogas* (procedures) for Sandhyā, congregational (*Sāmudāyika*) prayer, *upanayana*, marriage, *antyeṣṭi* (funeral rites), śrāddha, remarriage (of widows), re-conversion to Hinduism &c. That Committee prepared under the guidance of Swāmī Kevalānanda such *prayogas* shorn of unnecessary details and with translations in Marathi, which can be had from Mr. Kokaje of Lonavla. Among the resolutions the following deserve special mention: usages have been changed from time to time by former learned men (śiṣṭas) and the learned men of the present day have the authority to introduce changes in usages as the present circumstances may require; that the untouchability of the people of certain castes be abolished (Art. 17 of the Constitution of India subsequently did this); that those sub-castes that have similar usages,

---

2656. The original name was 'तत्त्वनिष्ठ-परिवर्तनवादिपरिषद्' (Assembly of people who favoured the making of changes based on some fundamental principles). Seven of the original fourteen members died subsequently viz. Svāmī Kevalānanda, Mahāmahopādhyāya Śrīdharaśāstri Pāṭhak (who became a Sannyāsin under the name Śaṅkarānanda-bhāratī), Sadāśivaśāstri Bhide, Dr. K. L. Daftari, Mr. J. S. Karandikar (editor of the Poona 'Kesarī' newspaper), Mr. C. M. Saptarshi (Advocate, Ahmednagar) and Prajñāneśvarayati, Tarkatīrtha Raghunāthaśāstri Kokaje of Lonavla (Dist. Poona) was the Secretary. Among the other original members are Mr. N. G. Chapekar (a nonagenarian, retired First Class Subjudge), a scholar of wide reading including Vedic literature, Dharmaśāstras, sociological studies and Tarkatīrtha Lakṣmaṇaśhāstri Joshi of Wai, who knows English well, studied all Darśanas and Śāstras under Swāmī Kevalānanda and is a critical scholar.

saṁskāras and rules about food should merge and such merger is not against Dharmaśāstra; there is no objection to any Hindu sitting in the same row with other persons of different varṇas provided vegetarians are served vegetarian eatables; that Hindus including untouchables are entitled to study the Veda and have upanayana performed with Vedic mantras and priests conversant with the upanayana procedure should be ready to do so, if invited; if any one takes to another religion owing to force or fraud or of his free will and wants to revert to the Hindu fold he should be allowed to come in after proper expiation and after undergoing a simple *vidhi*[2657]; marriages of spouses of the same gotra and pravara should be allowed provided there is no bar on the ground of sapiṇḍa relationship (vide Hindu Marriage Act, 25 of 1955, sec. 5 items 4 and 5); that divorce be allowed among the castes in which it is not allowed at present on the ground of conversion to another religion of one of the spouses &c. (almost the same grounds as in sec. 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act of 1955); a Hindu widow succeeding as heir to her husband takes an absolute estate except when any of the following relatives of the husband are alive, viz. daughter, daughter's son, mother, father, brother, brother's son, paternal grand-parents, paternal first cousin (vide Hindu Succession Act, 30 of 1956 sec. 14 which goes further by omitting the near relatives specified above). Most of the *decisions mentioned above were proclaimed from ten to twenty* years before our Constitution came into operation.

Among the standing complaints against brāhmaṇas one has been that they debarred millions of people called 'Śūdras' from Vedic studies. Therefore, the Maṇḍala announced that all Hindus (including the so called untouchables) should observe the worship of the sun, repetition of the Gāyatrī-mantra (Ṛg. III. 62.10, Tai. S. I. 5. 6. 4, Vāj. S. III. 35) and reading or recital of the Bhagavadgītā (whole or part) every day, since these common observances would help in creating the sentiment of

---

2657. Vide H. of Dh. Vol. IV pp. 828-830 where the 'Hindūkaraṇavidhi', prepared by the Dharmanirṇaya-maṇḍala for re-admission to Hinduism is set out in Sanskrit. This re-admission *vidhi* (in Sanskrit) has been translated into Marathi and Hindi.

cultural equality among all Hindus. The procedure of morning and evening (sandhyā) worship is brief and is quoted below.[2558]

In order to cultivate a sense of unity among all Hindus (including the so-called untouchables), the Maṇḍala prepared a congregational prayer (to be recited by all Hindus in a congregation once in a month) consisting of the following eleven passages culled from the Vedic literature, viz. Atharvaveda X. 8.1, Ṛg. X. 82.3, I. 164.16, Vāj. S. 25.21, Ṛg. X. 121. 10, Tai. Ār. 4.42.5, the Gāyatrīmantra, Bṛ. Up. I. 3.28 (asato mā sad-gamaya, tamaso mā jyotir-gamaya, mṛtyor māsmṛtam gamaya), Ṛg. X. 191.2–4. In many villages some people tried to introduce this congregational prayer, but after some time most people complained that they found it difficult to commit to memory and recite the Vedic passages and requested that similar congregational prayers be prepared in Hindi and therefore the Maṇḍala prepared a brief prayer of five verses in Hindi.

The above lines would only briefly illustrate how we would have to proceed if we want an emotional integration of all our countrymen, particularly on the social and religious plane. But we must not forget what the foundation of our culture and civilization has been throughout the past ages. Ancient sages laid the foundation by insisting upon this that there is and must be harmony between man's spirit and the spirit of the world and man's endeavour should be to realize in his actions and in his life this harmony and unity.[2659] The Upaniṣads teach that man gains by giving up (by renunciation) and exhorts man not to covet another's wealth (Īśopaniṣad I 'tena tyaktena bhuñjīthā mā gṛdhaḥ kasya svid dhanam ').

2658. प्रातः स्नात्वा पूर्वाभिमुखः, सायं हस्तौ पादौ च प्रक्षाल्य पश्चिमाभिमुखः आसने उपविश्य आचम्य प्राणानायम्य श्रीपरमेश्वरप्रीत्यर्थं प्रातः सन्ध्योपास्तिं करिष्ये इति प्रातः सङ्कल्पं कुर्यात्। श्रीपरमेश्वरप्रीत्यर्थं सायंसन्ध्योपास्तिं करिष्ये इति सायम्। ततः अर्घ्यप्रदानम्। ओं भूर्भुवः स्वः। तत्सवितुर्वरेण्यं भर्गो देवस्य धीमहि। धियो यो नः प्रचोदयात्। श्रीसूर्याय इदमर्घ्यं दत्तं न मम इति त्यागः। इति त्रिवारम्। अथ प्रातरुत्थाय सायमासीनः अष्टोत्तरशतं दशवारं वा—ओं भूर्भुवः स्वः तत्सवितुर्वरेण्यं भर्गो देवस्य धीमहि। धियो यो नः प्रचोदयात्॥ इति मन्त्रस्य जपं कुर्यात्। तत उपस्थानम्। पूषन्नेकर्षे यम सूर्य प्राजापत्य व्यूह रश्मीन् समूह तेजः। यत्ते रूपं कल्याणतमं तत्ते पश्यामि। योऽसावसौ पुरुषः सोऽहमस्मि (ईशावास्योपनिषद् 16) इति। ततः कर्मसमाप्तिं सोदकं ब्रूयात्। अनेन सन्ध्योपासनाख्येन कर्मणा भगवान्परमेश्वरः प्रीयताम्। ओं तत्सत्। इति द्विराचामेत्।

Two lines referring to Gotra, Pravara, Veda, Śākhā and Sūtra and to making an obeisance to Guru are omitted.

2659. Many thoughtful men in the West have been influenced immensely by the *advaita* Vedānta and its emphasis on sound moral

(*Continued on next page*)

The Bhagavadgītā emphasized doing one's duty without hankering for the rewards thereof. Science cannot answer such fundamental questions as occur to every thoughtful person viz. what is the ultimate cause, is it *brahman*, what is our origin, by what are we sustained, what is our destiny (goal), being influenced by what do we persist in paths leading to pain and misery (Śv. Up. I. 1.). They are answered by the ancient[2660] Upaniṣads, but not by science so far.

The chief aim of Indian culture and civilization was not to attain military and political power over other countries and peoples; it neglected to organize Indians for offensive and defensive purposes, nor encouraged the starting of immense corporations for the acquisition of wealth. But in these days of keen competition between nations and peoples we must not only keep a vigilant eye on the eternal principles of our culture but also on the worldly happiness of our countrymen in the midst of the warring elements in the world. Our people often took and take to premature *vairāgya* (renunciation), while Western nations and men have been laying for the last few centuries great store by extreme activity. Now that our leaders are thinking of remodelling our society and spiritual life they must cultivate qualities whereby they at least will be *sthitaprajña* i. e. fully developed or ideal souls (Bhagavadgītā II. 55–68) or men of God (Gītā XIII. 13–18). Social reforms and politics have to be preached through our age-old religion and philosophy.[2661] If a large majority of our people and the leaders throw away or neglect

---

(Continued from last page)

preparation before one can realize the One Essence underlying the universe; vide 'What Vedānta means to me a Symposium edited by John Yale (Rider & Co., London, 1961), in which the views of 16 writers are set out. That of Aldous Huxley summarizes (pp. 19-20) the Upaniṣadic doctrine in the same words as on p. 1631 above. The same summary he gave in his novel 'Time must have a stop' 1945, p. 289.

2660. ब्रह्मवादिनो वदन्ति । किं कारणं ब्रह्म कुतः स्म जाता जीवाम केन क्व च संप्रतिष्ठाः । अधिष्ठिताः केन सुखेतरेषु वर्तामहे ब्रह्मविदो व्यवस्थाम् । श्वेताश्व. उप. I. 1.; को न आत्मा, किं ब्रह्मेति । छा. उप. V, 11. 1.

2661. Our politicians seem at present to be treading the path humorously quoted from an American writer long before Independence by Prime Minister Nehru in his Autobiography' Politics is the gentle art of getting votes from the poor and campaign funds from the rich by promising to protect each from the other' (p. 131). In the same work Panditji says that Gandhiji's reference to Rāmarājya as a golden age jarred on his ears and that his close associates half humorously said that when *svarājya* (Independence) came these fads must not be encouraged (pp. 72–73).

religion and spirituality altogether, the probability is that we shall lose both spiritual life and social betterment. This is not the place to say more on this point. Vide pp. 1478–79 above for the sound moral preparation required before one realizes the pervasion of everything by *brahman* and pp. 1623 ff. for the proposition that the One Principle is variously named by sages, which taken together lead to universal brotherhood, kindliness and tolerance. From time immemorial all religious cults in India (except Buddhism and Jainism) recognized that there was One Principle (or Deity of some kind) and in the immortality of the soul. The tremendous march of science and mastery over some of the forces of nature has gone to the heads of many modern men and made them conceited. Science can disclose to us at the most secondary causes; but it has to be silent as to the ultimate cause and the ultimate destiny of man. It cannot tell us what the purpose of life is, it cannot tell us anything about moral values. The present and the following generations have to be trained in an environment where spiritual life, love of truth, sense of and belief in the brotherhood of man or at least of our own countrymen, love of peace and sympathy for the oppressed would be held to be supreme virtues to be attempted by all people.

It is most difficult to suggest in a brief space a code of conduct for all the millions of India. But for men of limited education and busy life a few suggestions by way of illustrations may be set out. The idea of pollution by the touch of men belonging to certain castes must be given up and much more therefore the idea of pollution by the mere shadow of certain people.[2662] Swāmī Vivekānanda (Works Vol. V. p. 152) was so angered as to say "The religion of India is at present dont touchism ". Reason and science must be resorted to for checking or abandoning dogmas based on ancient authority. The myths and legends of the Purāṇas on the origin of the universe, about eclipses and so forth that are not credible in the light of

2662. Vide H. of Dh of Vol. II p, 173–174 on the Smṛti rules about shadow (chāyā) showing gradual excess of exclusiveness in later times. मक्षिका विप्रुषश्छाया गौरश्वः सूर्यरश्मयः । रजो भूर्वायुरग्निश्च स्पर्शे मेध्यानि निर्दिशेत् ॥ मनु V. 133, विष्णु 23.51.

Vide above p. 242 where it is established that long before the first half of the 6th century, Indian astronomers had arrived at the correct causes of solar and lunar eclipses but even up to this day educated men often act in such a way that it seems that they believe in the demon Rāhu being the cause of eclipses.

science should not be included in the religious creeds of these days and should be treated as mere myths and legends. Many Christians even in these days (and most Hindus and Moslems) believe in a heaven above and a hell or hells below. But Śabara[2663] (in the first centuries of the Christian era) holds that heaven is not a place (vide pp. 1211-1215 above). Therefore, heaven and hell as described in ancient Sanskrit works cannot be made an article of faith for modern men. It is often said that myths may be represented as facts to simple people for the sake of beneficial results (e. g. for inducing them to perform sacrifices or to observe rules of morality &c.). But this is not proper as there are dangers in this. In these days of growing popular education, when the myth becomes exposed, the men who once believed it not only give up that myth but also might give up everything contained in ancient works as unbelievable. Space does not permit any elaborate cataloguing of what should be given up and what striven for in these days. Values, aims and institutions that were accepted by almost all people only a few decades ago are now challenged and new patterns are in process of being moulded. The chief catalytic agencies are modern science and Western thought and literature. The old structure of beliefs is tottering and laxity in morals has made great headway. But whatever happens, we must so regulate society that the family as a social unit[2664] is preserved and safeguarded, every child of whatever class or race must have equal opportunities of education, man's daily work must be held to be divine work and worship, great inequalities of wealth and possessions must be eliminated.

Swāmī Vivekānanda uttered the following exhortation long ago "The ignorant Indian, the poor and destitute Indian, the Brahman Indian, the Pariah Indian is my brother." "Repeat and pray day and night 'O Lord of Gaurī! make me a man'" quoted in "Sources of Indian Tradition" by W. T. de Bary and others (New York, 1958) p. 659. Vide Atharvaveda XII. 1.45 for universal brotherhood of all men whose mother is the Earth.

2663. Vide above pp. 1224-25 for criticism of Śabara's view that Veda invented stories that never happened.

2664. In 'This I believe' (philosophies of 100 thoughtful men and women in all walks of life) edited by E. P. Morgan (London, 1953), Sir Charles Darwin (author of 'New conception of matter and the next million years' and grandson of the author of 'the Origin of species') emphasizes 'the importance of family as the continuing unit of human life' (p. 30).

This volume (the last in the History of Dharmaśāstra) may be brought to a close with a quotation from the Kaṭhopaniṣad[2665] and another from Rabindranath Tagore's Gītāñjali :

'Get up, awake and having secured highly gifted (teachers) understand (the Truth); the sharp edge of a razor is difficult to pass over; thus the wise say that the path (to Realization) of Self) is hard' (Kaṭhopaniṣad);

Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high ;
Where knowledge is free ;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls ;
Where words come out from the depths of truth ;
Where *tireless* striving stretches its arms toward perfection ;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit ;
Where the mind is led forward by thee into ever-widening thought and action—
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake.

2665. उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत । क्षुरस्य धारा निशिता दुरत्यया दुर्गं पथस्तत्कवयो वदन्ति ॥ कठोप. III. 14.

EPILOGUE

Many friends and well-wishers of the author and some readers of the volumes of the History of Dharmaśāstra have often (personally and by correspondence) pressed him to furnish some biographical details about himself, about the circumstances in which he launched on this undertaking, about the preparations he made, about the time and labour that this undertaking cost him and also what money it brought to him (a few asked even this).

To write an autobiography is a most difficult and delicate matter. In an autobiography one has often to use the words 'I', 'Me', 'My' etc. and the writer is liable to be charged with egotism. If he is very frank about his own failings and faults, he may be accused of exhibitionism. I do not propose to say much about my parents or my ancestors or about my marriage and family life or my likes and dislikes. I had my own share of anxieties, troubles and sorrows, but I shall not say much about them, since the blessings that were showered on me far outweighed the anxieties and sorrows. A brief account of some aspects of my long life may, I hope, be of some interest and help to those who have to face problems similar to those that I had to face.

I was born on 7th May 1880 in a village called Peḍheṁ or Paraśurāma [because it has a large and famous temple of Paraśurāma, an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu and the patron saint of several brāhmaṇa sub-castes (such as the Citpāvana)] near Chiplun in the Ratnagiri District at my maternal uncle's house. My father belonged to a priestly family in a village called Murḍeṁ near Khed in the Ratnagiri District. My father had learnt by heart a great deal of the Ṛgveda and was being trained for priesthood till the age of 18. He did not like the profession of a priest and left for Poona to learn English along with a friend of his boyhood, the late Shankar Balkrishna Dixit, who later on became famous for his Marathi work on Indian Astronomy which was admired by Dr. Thibaut. Mr. Dixit and my father passed the Matriculation Examination of the Bombay University in 1873. My father studied for the Pleader's examination held in those days by the Bombay High Court, passed it and began to practise as a Taluka lawyer at Dapoli in the Ratnagiri District from 1878. Besides Vedic lore, my father studied the principal Upaniṣads

and the Gītā and had many of the former by heart. He practised as a lawyer for about forty years, then retired and passed away in 1925. We were nine children, six brothers and three sisters. I was the eldest of the sons and one sister was older than myself. In my early boyhood my father taught me some elements of astrology and advised me to commit to memory the verses of Amarakośa (of which I had 400 by heart before I was 12 years of age). In 1891 I joined the S. P. G. Mission's English High School at Dapoli and passed the Bombay University's Matriculation Examination in 1897 and stood high among the successful candidates. While at school, I began to suffer from hyper-acidity, consequent acute stomach pains and vomiting at the age of 16 and had to leave school for nearly a year. At the time when I passed the Matriculation there was an epidemic of Bubonic Plague in Bombay and Poona, where there was high mortality. My father was not willing to send me (whose health was already delicate) to those places where alone College education could then be had. So he asked me to study law under him. I studied it for two weeks, but being repelled soon by the dry study of law, I wrote a letter to Dr. Machichan, who was then Principal of the Wilson College in Bombay (and reputed to be very kind), conducted by the Scottish Mission, asking him whether I could be enrolled as a student *in absentia*. He asked me to send Rs. 36/–, a term's fee, get myself registered as a student and stated that as the epidemic was at its height the University might condone absence. The Bombay University later on did so. I did not attend College in the first term. The epidemic abated, I joined College in June and appeared for the first year's examination of the Bombay University in November 1898 (which was then called the Previous Exam.) and was awarded a scholarship of Rs. 175 and a prize of Rs. 100 for being the first among the students whose second language was Sanskrit. This was the first lucky accident in my life. Life is a mysterious business. It is full of lucky incidents or chances and one must be able to take advantage of them by one's own efforts. There have been many such incidents and disinterested friendships in my life and I have hardly ever had an enemy to my knowledge in the whole of my rather long life. The ailment of my boyhood pursued me at college, pursues me even now and has become worse, but I did not allow myself to be much disturbed by it, controlled my diet and led a regular and strict life. At the second year's examination in Arts (called Intermediate) I was awarded a scholarship of Rs. 180

(lump sum) for standing first among students taking Sanskrit as a second language. Two years afterwards I appeared for the B. A. examination in 1901 and was awarded the Bhau Daji Prize for proficiency in Sanskrit and stood first among the students of the Wilson College. An idea about how delicate I was in 1901 when I was 21 years old may be had from the fact that, though I was 5 feet 4 inches in height, I weighed only 98 pounds. After the B. A. examination I was a Dakṣiṇā Fellow at the Wilson College for two years and lectured to the first two years' classes at the Wilson College on Sanskrit about three hours a week. In 1902, I passed the First LL. B. examination in the First class and in 1903 the M. A. examination and was awarded the Zala Vedānta Prize of Rs. 400. The peculiarity of this prize is that the paper set is in Sanskrit, the answers are to be written in Sanskrit in three hours, the chief examiner was to be a Śāstri who was proficient in Śaṅkara Vedānta and had studied it under the old traditional methods. As my father had yet to spend for the education of several sons he asked me either to enter the Education Department as a High School teacher or to become a lawyer in a subordinate court. I did not like the latter idea and applied to the Director of Public Instruction, Poona, for appointment as a teacher in a Govt. High School. Here again Dr. Machichan helped me by recommending me highly to the D. P. I. I was appointed a teacher in the Govt. High School at Ratnagiri in August 1904 on a salary of Rs. 60 per month raised to Rs. 65 per month after a few months (having been an M. A. with five scholarships and prizes in Sanskrit). I was at the Ratnagiri Govt. High School for three years. I appeared for the S. T. C. (Secondary Teacher's Certificate) Examination held by the Department in 1905 and stood first in the whole of the Bombay Presidency (including Sind in those days). In the same year I submitted an essay on 'Aryan Manners and Morals as depicted in the Epics' for the V. N. Mandlik Gold Medal of the Bombay University and was awarded a prize of books worth Rs. 150. For this essay I read both the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa. Till now I have read the Mahābhārata thrice and I have yet got the notebooks of extensive extracts, particularly from the Mahābhārata. In the next year I appeared for a Departmental Examination for Honours in Teaching and secured first class in 'Logic in relation to teaching'. The same year (1906) I submitted a paper on 'the History of Alaṅkāra Literature' for the V. N. Mandlik Gold Medal again and was awarded the medal. At the end

of this year I lost my younger brother by T. B. I was transferred at my own request to the Elphinstone High School in Bombay as 5th assistant on Rs. 75 in April 1907. There were over 40 teachers in that High School and about 750 students from the 4th to the 7th standard. I was made Head Sanskrit teacher (there were three teachers of Sanskrit and 12 classes in Sanskrit). Towards the end of 1907 the post of Assistant to the Professor of Sanskrit at the Poona Deccan College (on Rs. 125 p. m.) fell vacant and I applied for the post. But I was not appointed and another person who was an M. A. in Sanskrit, but had won no prize, scholarship or medal in Sanskrit at any examination from the Matriculation to the M. A. and who was 9th Assistant in the Elphinstone High School (where I was 5th assistant) was appointed to the post, because he was a favourite student of the D. P. I. when the latter was Principal of the Deccan College. I sent a protest through the Principal of the High School. I was informed that a competent authority in Sanskrit had recommended that the person chosen was superior to me in Sanskrit and when I requested the D. P. I. to let me know the name of the competent authority I was informed that my letter was an impertinent one and deserved no reply. This added insult to injury. This happened in December 1907. I decided to appear for the 2nd LL. B. examination in November 1908 and then to leave Govt. service. My supersession created a great deal of criticism in the Department and almost all persons sympathised with me and helped me in various ways. I appeared for the 2nd LL. B. examination in November 1908 and passed it. This created an impression in the Education Department that I meant serious business. Therefore, as a sop to my injured feelings, I was appointed to act as Professor of Sanskrit at the Elphinstone College from February to April 1909 in place of Prof. S. R. Bhandarkar who had been deputed on some Govt. work. I reverted to the High School at the end of April 1909 and began to cast about where to practise as a lawyer. I was not inclined to practise as a lawyer in subordinate courts and decided that, if I left service, I would practise on the Appellate side of the High court, where it is a battle of wits and of hard work and one had not to do what a lawyer practising in the subordinate courts had to do. At that time, the late Mr. Daji Abaji Khare was almost at the top of the Appellate side Bar (called Vakils of the High Court). He had some large estates at Dapoli (my native place) and knew my father and myself. I approached him for advice. He told me that I must

have with me at least two thousand rupees in cash, if I wanted to practise in the High Court and to stick to it. I had then not a pie with me and my father who was already sixty years old and had to educate other sons, declined to help. In less than two years from June 1909 I brought out two school books and one annotated book in Sanskrit (the Sāhityadarpaṇa) for College students and was also appointed an examiner in Sanskrit at the Previous and Intermediate Arts Examinations. I thus collected two thousand rupees, resigned from Govt. service at the end of June 1911 and applied for a Sanad (after paying Rs. 500 as fee for enrolment as a Vakil of the High Court of Bombay) with a certificate of good moral character from Mr. Khare and was enrolled as a Vakil of the High Court on 5th July 1911 when I was in my 32nd year.

Work was slow in coming and the first two years were rather bleak. Having not much to do, I appeared for the LL. M. examination in Hindu and Mahomedan law in 1912 and passed it. From 1911 to about 1918 I brought out every year some book or books such as the Kādambarī of Bāṇa in three parts with ample notes, the Harṣacarita in two parts, and the Uttararāmacarita. I also conducted a private law class for coaching students for the High Court Vakil's examination (in which 60 percent marks were required for passing). This brought in a steady income of about Rs. 100 per month for four years from 1913 to 1917 and, what was more important, this task of teaching single-handed the vast field of law made me proficient in all complicated legal topics. In the meantime, in 1913 I was appointed Wilson Philological Lecturer to deliver six lectures on Sanskrit, Prakrit and allied languages for a lump sum of Rs. 750. In 1913 I became an ordinary member of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society and a life.member (by paying a lump sum of Rs. 500) in January 1915. At the beginning of 1915 I was appointed by the Bombay University a Springer Research Scholar for two years on a salary of Rs. 100 per month, the subject of research being 'Ancient Geography of Mahārāṣṭra' (part published in JBBRAS, Vol. XXIV for 1917, pp. 613–657). In 1916 I worked as Honorary Professor of Sanskrit at the Wilson College, when Prof. S. R. Bhandarkar, who was permanent Professor, fell ill, and I lectured for three hours a week to B. A. classes on the most difficult part of Rāmānuja's Bhāṣya on Vedāntasūtra.

In 1917 June I was appointed as a Professor of Law in the Govt.

Law College at Bombay. This was again a case of an unexpected event. The Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court had recommended for a vacancy in the law college two names from among the Vakils on the Appellate side Bar of the High Court, one a very senior gentleman and myself who had less than six years' practice. The senior gentleman for some reason (not given out) refused at the last moment and on 20th June, the day on which the Law College was to open, I received a wire in the Vakil's room from Government stating that Govt. proposed to appoint me as a Professor of Law from that day and that if I agreed I should see the Principal. This was a comfortable job, the salary being Rs. 350 a month and the duties light viz. three or four hours per week in the evening from 5-45 p.m. to 6-45 p.m. I was Professor of Law for six years (1917-1923). Hardly any Vakil with less than six years' practice on the Appellate Side of the High Court had been appointed before me as Professor of Law.

I had undertaken about 1911 an edition of the Vyavahāramayūkha with explanatory notes on the advice of Prof. S. R. Bhandarkar who was one of the General Editors of the Bombay Govt.'s Sanskrit Series. But, owing to fluctuations in my own fortunes, I had neglected the work and had almost decided to give up the undertaking altogether. The Bombay Govt.'s Sanskrit Series came to be transferred by Govt. to the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute that had been started in Poona in 1917. The authorities of the Institute pressed me to carry out my undertaking. I agreed and began to read the vast Dharmaśāstra Literature for that purpose. The edition of the Vyavahāramayūkha of Nīlakaṇṭha (text based on three printed editions and eight mss., an Introduction of 47 pages and exhaustive notes) was published in 1926 by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. In the brief Preface to that edition of 1926, I announced that I had undertaken to write the History of Dharmaśātra Literature.

Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar had expressed a desire to donate his large library of thousands of books to some Institute that would properly house them, take care of them and make it a centre of Sanskrit studies. Dr. Belvalkar, Dr. Gune and several others supported the idea and about thirty people including myself contributed Rs. 500 each for the purchase of a big vacant plot of 30 acres in Poona and, after setting aside nearly half of the purchased plot for

the Institute to be named after Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, distributed the rest among the original contributors as plot-holders. The public and Govt. supported the Institute and the famous Tatas donated money to construct a suitable building. The first project undertaken was the publication of the critical edition of the Mahābhārata. Govt. made grants, transferred the Bombay Sanskrit Series to the Institute, the Chief of Aundh promised a lakh of rupees for the Mahābhārata edition with pictures and later the Nizam of Hyderabad contributed a large sum for building a guest-house for scholars from India and abroad.

The first volume of the History of Dharmaśāstra, which was published in 1930, deals with the chronology and relative importance of famous and less known writers and works and covers 760 pages. As I regarded myself as one of the original founders of the B. O. R. I. and as I was a successful lawyer on the Appellate side of the High Court, I offered the volume to that Institute for publication without any agreement about payment. The Preface to the first volume makes it clear that I intended to finish the whole history in two volumes and that even at that time I suffered from a painful complaint (duodenal ulcer) which has dogged my footsteps throughout up to this day. The second volume of the History of Dharmaśāstra covering 1368 pages (including about 300 pages on Śrauta ritual, not included in the original plan) was published in June 1941 (i. e. eleven years after the publication of the first volume), when I was already 61 years old and pursued by an implacable ailment. The third volume containing 1088 pages was published in October 1946 and deals with only three topics 'Rājadharma, Vyavahāra, and Sadācāra' (customs and customary law). On account of the 2nd world war there was paper shortage and the finances of B. O. R. I. were at a low ebb. I had therefore to advance three thousand rupees to the B. O. R. I. and had to purchase paper worth several hundred rupees for expediting the printing, in view of the fact that I was in my 67th year and that my physical condition was causing anxiety. The 4th volume is spread over 926 pages, was published in October 1953 (when I was in my 74th year) and deals with Pātaka (sins), Prāyaścitta (expiation), Karmavipāka (fruition of evil deeds), Antyeṣṭi (rites on death), Āśauca (impurity on death and birth), Śuddhi (purification), Śrāddha, Tīrthayātrā (pilgrimages to sacred places).

The (fifth and) last volume deals with numerous topics, as the Table of Contents will show. The first part of 718 pages dealing with Vrata (sacred vows, observances and festivals) and Kāla was separately published in 1958 (as I had then an attack of heart trouble, and it was thought that I might not survive, being more than 78 years old at that time). The second part now printed deals with Śāntis, Purāṇas in relation to Dharmaśāstra, causes of the disappearance of Buddhism from India, Tantras and Dharmaśāstra, Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Tarka and Dharmaśāstra, Pūrvamīmāṁsā and Dharmaśāstra, Cosmology, doctrine of Karma and Punarjanma, dominant characteristics of our Indian culture and civilization and future trends. This volume has been in the press for over five years and has involved an enormous amount of varied reading and writing for over eight years from 1953.

In describing how and in how many years the H. of Dh. developed, I have not said anything about the environment in which I had to work. From about 1918 I began to have good work as a lawyer. I not only conducted cases in the Bombay High Court, but I appeared before the District Courts of the mofussil in several districts such as Khandesh, Nagar, Poona, Sholapur, Satara, and Ratnagiri. I owe a great deal to my college friends, to my students that passed the High Court Vakil's examination after attending my private law class and to Mr. M. K. Athavle of Sangli and Mr. C. M. Saptarishi of Ahmednager for sending me much legal work.

I took part in many of the intellectual activities in Bombay and Poona. I was a member of the Senate of the Bombay University from 1919 to 1928, I have been throughout a member of the Regulating Council of the Bhandarkar Institute and of its other bodies. I was closely connected for over 40 years with the Marathi Granthasaṅgrahālaya of Bombay in various capacities and with the Brāhmaṇasabhā of Bombay in many capacities as Chairman of the Managing Committee, a Trustee for 21 years and Adviser from 1918 to this day.

I had argued gratis several cases for some societies and individuals. Mr. Javdekar, lawyer of Dhulia, espoused the cause of people who had grievances against the Indian Railways. I conducted many such railway cases and cases of poor and helpless people. One of these latter was that of a poor untonsured brāhmaṇa widow who had been prevented by the priests in the temple of Vithoba at Pandharpur

from offering worship to the image by placing her head at the feet of the image (because she was untonsured) as all Hindus, male or female, of all castes were allowed to do. I had to go to Pandharpur thrice at my own expense and spent in all seven days in court. The court decided in favour of the widow. The case is referred to in the History of Dharmaśāstra, vol. II p. 593 and the arguments are set out on pp. 587–593 of the volume.

Another case that I conducted gratis is that of the Deccan College, Poona. This College was started by Govt. but a Parsi Baronet, Sir Jamsetji, made in the early sixties of the 19th century a munificent donation of about two lakhs with the stipulation that it was to be maintained as an educational Institution for ever on the lines already laid down. The British Govt. on the suggestion of an Indian Minister wanted to close the College and made a contract for sale of the site and buildings for a Parsi Public School. Some of the Old Boys of the College such as Prof. S. G. Sathe and Dr. Belvalkar consulted me what to do, though I was not an old boy of the Deccan College. I first suggested that a member of the Bombay Legislative Council should ask a question whether the Deccan College was not an Institution held in trust by Govt. The Govt. replied that it was a trust property, but that Govt. would approach the District Court of Poona for permission to sell it for the purpose of a public school. Govt. applied to the District Court at Poona for permission to sell it for the purpose of a public school. I appeared for the old Boys' Association and requested that the Association should be made a party to Govt's application. The Court allowed the application. I had agreed not to charge any fees. I suggested that Mr. M. R. Jayakar, who had a great regard for me and was a very successful advocate in Bombay (who later became a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England), should be briefed in the matter. The Association said that they had not money enough to pay Mr. Jayakar's heavy fees. I requested Mr. Jayakar not to charge any fees. He complied with my request and the whole case took about 15 working days in court, besides many days of preparation. Mr. Jayakar, having once agreed to work without fees, put his heart and soul in the matter and the District Court in a long judgement of about ninety typed pages held that the Deccan College was a trust and could not be sold. Govt. went in appeal to the High Court of Bombay, but by that time a popular Ministry with the

late Mr. B. G. Kher as Chief Minister had come to power and compromised the matter by agreeing to conduct the Deccan College as a Research Institute for Vedic studies and classical Sanskrit, Ancient Indian History etc. The Association made Mr. Jayakar and myself Honorary members of the Old Boys' Association. I have been on the Managing Council of the Deccan College Research Institute since 1938 to this day.

In 1944 I was appointed by the Bombay University Sir Lallubhai Shah Lecturer and delivered four lectures on Hindu customs and modern laws. The lectures have been published in book form by the University.

In 1927 at the time of the Gaṇapati festival in Bombay, a *mela* (party of worshippers) of the Mahar caste (held untouchable) approached the authorities of the Brāhmaṇasabhā for permission to come for *darśan* of the image installed by the Sabhā and stated that they would be content if they were allowed to come as near the image as Parsis, Christians and Moslems would be allowed to do. I was then Chairman of the Managing Committee and called a meeting of the Committee to decide whether the request should be granted. In the Committee the voting was exactly half for and half against. I had to give a casting vote for granting permission, since I was of the opinion that the request was a very modest one and in view of the changing times should be acceded to. A suit was filed in the Bombay High Court by certain orthodox people against the Brāhmaṇasabhā, against myself as Chairman of the Managing Committee and the Secretary for a temporary injunction restraining us from bringing the Mahar Mela inside the building where the image was and for a declaration that the Sabhā through its office-bearers had no right to do what had not been previously done. It must be said to the credit of the members of the Sabhā that in a meeting of the general body of members my action was supported by a very large majority. Tnere was great excitement and it was feared that violence might result. The High Court refused to grant a temporary injunction and later the suit was withdrawn by the members seeking legal relief. Our Constitution has abolished untouchability but that was in 1950 and this excitement arose in 1927.

I have been a member of the Managing Committee of the Bombay Asiatic Society for about 45 years, a Vice-President and one

of the editors of the Journal of the Society for many years. I contributed many long articles to the Journal of the Society and to the Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute. In 1946 at my request Dr. B. C. Law, a great scholar, whom I had never seen but who had become an admirer of my books, donated Rs. three thousand (for purchase of books for the Society) and donated five thousand rupees for founding a medal called P. V. Kane Gold Medal to be awarded once every three years to a scholar who had done substantial research in subjects in which I was interested.

On 7th May 1941, in honour of my 61st birthday 'A volume of studies in Indology' was presented to me edited by Dr. S. M. Katre and Prof. P. K. Gode and published by Dr. N. G. Sardesai of the Oriental Book Agency, Poona. My friends and admirers had formed a Committee with Dr. V. S. Sukthankar as Chairman and invited papers. Many contributions came in, of which 74 are contained in that work, mostly written by Indian scholars (a few by scholars from abroad also).

In 1942 the British Govt. conferred on me the title of Mahāmahopādhyāya and the Allahabad University conferred on me the Honorary Degree of D. Litt. In 1946 I was asked to preside over the All India Oriental Conference held at Nagpur. In 1947 Mr. B. G. Kher, then Chief Minister of the Bombay State, pressed me to become Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University for two years and I agreed after some hesitation owing to my age (about 68). There was no salary attached to the post nor was there any sumptuary allowance nor any other allowance. In the years 1947 to 1949 I had three matters on my hands, my legal practice, the History of Dharmaśāstra and the work as Vice-Chancellor (which was heavy in those days, sometimes three hours a day). Mr. Kher pressed me to remain Vice-Chancellor for three years more, offered to make it a salaried post of 2000 Rs. per month and requested me to give up practice as Advocate. The then Governor of Bombay, Sir Maharaj Singh, as Chancellor, also pressed me, but for various reasons (the foremost being that the work on the History of Dharmaśāstra would make slow progress if I spent five or more hours a day in the University) I declined. The Session of the All India Oriental Conference was held in Bombay in 1949. I was Chairman of the Reception Committee. On my request the Śākuntala of Kālidāsa was performed in Sanskrit with songs, the director being Mr. K.C.M.

Bhatavdekar who is a fine-looking and tall man, an excellent actor, a good Sanskritist and a singer. It was a great success. Emboldened by this success I suggested that other Sanskrit dramas should be put up on the stage. Mr. Bhatawdekar and Mr. P. P. Joshi, two enthusiastic workers of the *Sanskritic Samiti* (Cultural Committee) of the Brāhmaṇasabhā at Bombay, worked hard and at different times and in different places (Delhi, Bombay, Ujjain, Poona) put up on the stage ten Sanskrit dramas, Śākuntala, Mṛcchakaṭika, Ratnāvali, Veṇīsaṁhāra, Uttararāmacarita, Mudrārākṣasa, Vikramorvaśīya, Mālavikāgnimitra, Svapnavāsavadattā and Saṅgīta Saubhadra (translated into Sanskrit by Mr. S. B. Velankar, Indian Postal Service, from the original Marathi by Anna Kirloskar). These performances became very popular. The sale of tickets yielded 150,000 Rs. out of which about thirty thousand were saved after meeting all expenses as a fund to fall back upon when they performed one of these plays at different places.

The International Congress of Orientalists was held in Paris in 1948. The Indian Govt. sent a delegation of three, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan as leader and Dr. S. K. Chatterji and myself as two members. In 1951 the International Congress met in Istanbul and the Indian Govt. sent a delegation consisting of myself (as leader), Dr. R. C. Majumdar and Prof. Siddiqui. At this conference I sponsored a resolution that the Unesco should make a substantial grant to the project of a Sanskrit Dictionary on Historical Principles undertaken by the Deccan College and it was unanimously passed by the Conference and subsequently Unesco made a grant of 5000 dollars to the Deccan College. In 1954 the Session of the International Congress of Orientalists was held at Cambridge to which the Govt of India sent a delegation consisting of myself (as leader), Dr. S. K. Chatterji and Dr. R. N. Dandekar. From Cambridge I went at my own expense to U. S. A. and visited the Library of the Congress in Washington for two days, the University of Princeton, Harvard University and the University of Rochester, where my younger son was studying for the Ph. D. degree in Atomic and Nuclear Physics. The Governing Body of the London School of Oriental and African studies of the London University was pleased to nominate me as an Honorary Fellow, I being the only Indian among the present 25 Honorary Fellows of the School. In December 1953 I presided over the session of the Indian History Congress at Waltair.

In November 1953 the President of India was pleased to nominate me as a member of Parliament i. e. of the Rājyasabhā (Council of States) and when my term expired on 1-4-58 I was again nominated for six years. While in Parliament I worked on several committees such as the Committees for considering the Hindu Adoption Act, the Hindu Marriage Act, the Hindu Succession Act. I pressed on the Govt. that they should start a Central Institute of Indian Studies. This has been now accepted in principle and a committee has been appointed to suggest a constitution and other matters. I have also been a member of the Central Sanskrit Board. On 15th August 1958 the President of India was pleased to grant me a certificate of merit and an annuity of Rs. 1500 a year. In August 1959 the President was pleased to nominate me as National Professor of Indology for five years on a substantial salary, the only condition being that I should carry on research as I have been doing. I resigned from Parliament in September 1959, because as I held an office of profit under Govt., I had to do so according to law. In 1960 the University of Poona conferred on me the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Letters.

From the beginning of 1955 I did not take any fresh legal work and by March 1956 I got all my cases disposed off. Since April 1956 I have systematically refused all pressure to accept briefs. Since April 1956 I have devoted my time to Parliamentary work (till September 1959 only) and to the last volume of the History of Dharmaśāstra.

I had substantial legal work from 1919 to about 1949. For the benefit of those who made inquiries and of those who desire to pursue literary studies while working as lawyers, I shall briefly state how I saved time for literary work. The High Court worked for five days in the week. I always utilized all holidays for literary work, Saturday and Sunday have always been my busiest days. There were always two Benches (sometimes three Benches also) on the Appellate side of the High Court. Often ten appeals were placed on the board for each Bench every day, since the practice of the Court has been that if an Advocate had two matters, one in each of the different courts and he was engaged in one court, his case in the other court was kept back till he became free. So when an advocate had even one appeal in one court and that too very low down in the list, even then he had to be present in court from the beginning, since appeals

lower down on the Board might be taken up by the Court if the lawyers therein were available. Most lawyers when free spent their time in chitchat in the Advocates' room. I spent such time in the Library for preparing my briefs that were likely to be taken up in the next few weeks. I hardly ever read my briefs at home. Therefore, I could devote every day some hours in the morning and evening to my work on Sanskrit studies. I always worked for eight or nine hours a day and sometimes ten to twelve hours from 1911 to 1948, except when I was not in Bombay. I have never slept or even taken a nap by day from 1904 to 1958; even when I went to see a drama at night and came home at 2 A.M. I awoke at 6 A.M. and slept a little earlier on the following night. After the mild heart trouble in 1958, I tried sleeping a little by day, but not being used to such a thing I gave it up in a few months. For fifty years I have been taking morning walk for about one hour on the Chowpati sea face in Bombay and at the Hanging Gardens since 1912, but stopped going to the Hanging Gardens from about 1956.

That I had duodenal ulcer was discovered by x-ray therapy about 1925. Some doctors advised an operation. Others opposed it. I consulted the then most eminent surgeon in Bombay, Dr. G. V. Deshmukh, and he advised me not to go in for it. Again in 1937 when I undertook a trip in European countries for three months, I consulted in Vienna an eminent German doctor who advised me to continue my dietetic methods and not to undergo an operation, when I was nearly 58 and the disease was of very long standing.

A few words about my method of collecting materials for my History of Dharmaśāstra. I have about a hundred note-books, some of them subjectwise and some with pages marked from A to Z, in which I noted important pages and passages extracted from the works read. For example, I have a big oblong notebook (leather bound) of about 500 pages devoted to Purāṇas only.

As regards the writing of the History of Dharmaśāstra my method was as follows: I wrote in my own hand a first draft, collected a hundred pages or so and then carefully read those pages. Sometimes I tore off several pages and prepared a new draft. I cannot type well, having had no time to cultivate the habit of using a typewriter. Then I got the matter typewritten by an excellent typist, Mr. G. R. Barve, who was my neighbour and who could decipher my bad writing tolerably well and paid him his usual

charges. I sent to the Press only the handwritten original of the first volume. It was from the 2nd volume onwards that I got one or two copies typewritten (two when there was danger of bombing Bombay in 1942) and sometime afterwards I read the typed copy myself and put in the diacritical marks. This was sent to the Press in Poona I examined three (rarely four) proofs of all forms myself, but the press had directions to send a copy of the third page proof to a good Sanskrit scholar in Poona who was to read it and make corrections (not in the matter but only as to diacritical marks, spelling, stops etc.) and to send the corrected proof to me and I incorporated his corrections (if accepted by me) in my own copy of the third proof, which was sent to the Press as the final proof. The Indexes to all the five volumes were prepared by me. The Indexes to volumes I-IV alone come to 289 pages. The total printed pages of all works written and printed by me and of the numerous papers that I contributed to the Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, the Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute and to other Journals would come to at least twenty thousand pages. To the typewriters of vol. II to V, I paid about 2500 rupees out of my own pocket and about 600 rupees to the correctors of the page proofs (of volume II to V). I went to places that had collections of Sanskrit Mss. such as Poona (very often), Baroda, Benares (several times), Madras (several times), Tanjore and Ujjain at my own expense for reading several mss. and getting copies made of a few of them. In our country, there are no large libraries like those in Europe and U. S. A. So I had to spend money on securing micro-films of certain articles in foreign journals and copies of certain Mss. I have no accounts of the travelling charges but about making copies of some mss. and microfilms I can say that they came to about 200 rupees. The Press was in Poona and I was in Bombay and the proofs (along with the original copy at the time of the despatch of the first proof) had to be sent by post for about 35 years (sometimes one form, sometimes two and rarely three at a time). Besides, the original ms. had always to be sent in small packets (of from 50 to 100 handwritten or typed pages) by registered bookpost. No accounts are kept of this but probably Rs. 400 would be a very modest estimate. The honorarium paid (and to be paid) to me for all the five volumes is given in the table below :

For the information of those who have already inquired or

might inquire hereafter about the cost of this undertaking viz., History of Dharmaśāstra, a table is appended:—

Volumes	Year of publication	Cost of Printing, paper, binding	Honorarium
		Rs. as.	Rs. as.
I	1930	4814 - 12	2433 - 0
II pts. 1 and 2	1941	8828 - 12	4239 - 0
III	1946	8605 - 12	2256 - 0
IV	1953	11092 - 9	2873 - 0
V part I	1958 }	25,000 - 0	7000 - 0
part II	1962 }	(Approximately)	(Approximately) the II part is to be hereafter published
		58341 - 13	18802 - 0
		18802 - 0	
		77,143 - 13	

3900 copies of volumes II–V are unbound as follows:—

	Copies unbound
Vol. II parts 1 and 2	1000
Volume III	800
Volume IV	1000
Volume V pt. 1	1100
	3900 copies

The charges for binding these 3900 copies at Rs. 2/- (per copy) would be Rs. 7,800 (3900 x 2).

Thus the cost of the whole series would be Rs. 84,943-13-0 (77,143-13 + 7,800). It must be mentioned that the Executive Board of the B. O. R. I. paid me Rs. three per page as to Volumes I, II and IV and only Rs. two per page for vol. III and propose to pay me Rs. four per page for Vol. V, leaving me to bear all expenses for typewritten copy, for correction of one proof by a third person, all postage, travelling expenses and for copies of mss. and microfilms.

The usual method in India as regards Histories or Encylopaedias in several volumes (running into thousands of pages) is to appoint a Director or Chief Editor (on a salary of Rs. 1500 per month), an Assistant Editor (on a salary of Rs. 600 or Rs. 750 per month) and to pay contributors at Rs. five or so per page, beside an office and a staff of clerks and typists. The Director's salary on the usual scale for one year alone would come to Rs. 18,000. The payments made and to be made to me for writing a work of over six thousand pages spread over 37 years come practically to one year's salary for a Chief Editor (or rather less by Rs. 3700 which were spent for typewriting, correction, and copies etc. as stated above). I do not like this distasteful task. I had, however, to write about this matter because I wanted to dispel the queer notions about my profits that some people appear to entertain and made inquiries. It is owing to one individual's sacrifice that all the volumes (containing over 6000 pages) can be sold by the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute for only Rs. 180. If the usual method had been followed, these 6000 pages would have had to be priced at Rs. 400 or more.

I could not arrange or plan my life. I had to oscillate between education, literature and law, between Government service and an independent profession like that of law. I have, however, lived a very active, full and varied life for over sixty years. Thinking over the vast Sanskrit literature and the labour and time that I had to spend on one branch of it, I am inclined to close this Epilogue with two lines from Browning's poem " The last ride together "

> ' Look at the end of the work, contrast
> The petty done, the undone vast.'

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND THANKS

During the last thirty-seven years from 1925 to this day I have received from hundreds of friends and others, institutions and books, assistance of various kinds. Now that this undertaking is drawing to a close, I should like to mention with gratitude all of them that I can remember. In the Prefaces to the several volumes of this History I have acknowledged the help received from individuals in writing the separate volumes. Here at the end of the whole work,

I shall try to mention in one place the Institutions, the series of books and individuals to whom I have been indebted.

INSTITUTIONS

Among Institutions the first place must be assigned to the Library of the Bombay Asiatic Society (formerly called Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society). It was in this Library that I passed several hours almost every day (except on holidays), when I was in Bombay. It has also a large collection of Sanskrit Mss. The materials for the first four volumes were collected mainly in the rooms of this Library. I owe a deep debt of gratitude to this Library and to all persons in the service of the Library from the highest to the lowest. I must next mention the Library of the Bombay University, which was also of great use to me. The Library of the Bombay Asiatic Society is a circulating Library with a large membership, but the Bombay University Library permits only the members of the Senate to have books issued to them for reading at home. I could secure books urgently needed by me from this Library, when I could not get them from the Asiatic Society's Library (because some members had taken them). Besides, it possesses a large number of Sanskrit Mss. I tender my thanks to the Bombay University and its Library, to the staff of the Library and particularly to Mr. D. N. Marshall, the present Librarian. Since November 1953 when I was nominated a member of Parliament (Rājyasabhā) by the President of India, two more Libraries became available to me. One was the Library of Parliament which contains a large number of books on many subjects including Sanskrit Literature, Ancient Indian History, and the Library of the Archaeological Department in New Delhi. I thank the staff of the Parliament Library. Dr. A. Ghosh, Director-General of the Archaeological Survey of India, made special arrangements for seating me in the Archaeological Library and made me a corresponding member. Dr. Chabbra, Joint Director of that Department, also was very kind and helpful. I am under great obligations to these high Officers. When at the end of 1953, I went to the Library of the Archaeological Department, the Librarian was a young man, Shri L. G. Parab, a double M. A. of the Bombay University, a B. T. and holder of a diploma in Librarianship. He is a very industrious and enthusiastic young Librarian, who made great efforts to keep the Library

full of Sanskrit books, full of books both on ancient and medieval history of India and of other countries, and of books on all archaelogical studies, such as architecture, iconography and painting, kept the Library uptodate and took a keen interest in my work and a great deal of trouble to accommodate me in various ways (too many to mention) from 1954 to the present day. Much of the material for this lengthy 5th volume was collected in the Archaeological Library and a good deal of the text also was written there. I am under a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Parab and also thank all his assistants, particularly Messrs. Kapur and Mr. A. S. Dhavle and his Jamadar, Bhagavat Sahai.

Then I must mention certain Series of books and certain Presses that have printed and published a large number of books, such as the Ānandāśrama series (Poona), the Bibliotheca Indica Series the Bombay Sanskrit Series, the Kāvyamālā and the Nirṇayasāgar Press, Calcutta Oriental Series, Chowkhamba S. Series, Cultural Heritage of India, volumes I–IV (Calcutta), the Gujarati Press and its Sanskrit Series, the Gaikwad Oriental Series (Baroda), Haridas Sanskrit Series (Benaras), Harvard Oriental Series, Kashi Sanskrit Series, Jivanand Vidyasāgar's numerous publications, Prājñapāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala's volumes of Dharmakośa and Mīmāṁsā-kośa (Wai), Kashmir Sanskrit Series, the Manikyachandra Digambar Jain Series, Jain Grantha-mala Series, Pali Texts Society's Series, Prince of Wales Sarasvatībhavana Series of texts and Studies, Pandit S. D. Satavalekar's Series of Vedic Saṁhitās, Sacred Books of the East Series (50 valumes including the valuable Index Volume), St. Petersburg Dictionary by Bohthlingk and Roth, the Vaidika Saṁśodhana-maṇḍal's volume of 18 Upaniṣads with valuable footnotes and Index (Poona), Trivandrum S. Series, Vedic Index (in two volumes) of Macdonell and Keith, Vijianagram S. Series.

Among periodicals I must mention, the Epigraphia Indica, the Indian Antiquary and those indexed under the word 'Journal'.

I am highly obliged to many scholars who contributed appreciative and encouraging reviews in several journals and newspapers. The first and third volumes received the largest number of reviews. I shall mention only a few for each volume. The first was reviewed in the Bombay Law Reporter, volume 32 (Journal pp. 94–95), in J. A. O. S. for 1931 volume 61 pp. 80–84 by Prof. Hopkins, in JRAS. for 1932 pp. 158–161 by Prof. S. V. Fitzgerald, I. H. Q.

for 1932, pp. 805–807 by Amareshwar Thakur, J. of Oriental Research, Madras, for 1931 pp. 231–233 by Prof. Kuppuswami Sastri, by the 'Kesari' of Poona in three issues dated 7th, 10th, 14th March 1931 (in Marathi); Volume II was reviewed by Prof. K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar in very eulogistic terms in Adyar Library Bulletin for 1944 pp. 75–86, in J. R. A. S. for 1942 pp. 106–107 by Prof. Brough; Vol. III was reviewed in "Indian Culture" by Dr. B. C. Law, Volume XIII for 1947 pp. 119–23, in Journal Asiatique for 1948, vol. 236 pp. 149–150 by Prof. L. Renou' and also in his book " Sanskrit et Culture" (Paris, 1950) pp. 126–136, in J. A. O. S. Vol. 67 pp. 232–234 by Dr. Ludwik Sternbach, in M. L. J. Vol. 93 for 1947 (Journal pp. 33–38), in newspaper "Hindu" of 25. 5. 1947 (Madras) by Prof. K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, in Bom. Law Reporter for January 1947 (Journal pp. 13–15), in the "Bombay Chronicle" of 9–2–1947 by Mr. Prabhu and in the 'Times of India' of 13. 6. 1947, by Mr. N. C. Kelkar in "Kesari" of 2nd and 5th December 1947, in 'Prabhāt' (a Marathi newspaper) in seven issues in March and May 1947 by Shri N. G. Chapekar; Volume IV was reviewed at some length by Prof. Hans Losch of Bonn in Z. D. M. G. Volume 107 pp. 217–221, and in 56 Bom. L. R. (1954 pp. 34–35 Journal), in the Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute, volume X pp. 168–172, in J. A. O. S. Vol. 74, pp. 271–273 by Dr. Sternbach, in the Bulletin of the London School of Oriental and African Studies, Volume 17, part 3 for October 1955 pp. 620–21 and in the "Kesari" of 26th September 1954 by Mr. J. S. Karandikar; Volume V part I was reviewed in J. A. O. S. for 1959 by Dr. Sternbach, in J. R. A. S. 1960 pp. 193–194 by Dr. Derrett. Volumes I to IV were reviewed by Prof. V. I. Kalyanov in the Quarterly Journal of the Indo-Soviet Cultural Society, volume VII No. 4 pp. 7–10 (1960). The number of Individual authors whose works I read or whom I consulted in 37 years may run into thousands. Authors and works referred to only once or twice are not collected here, but they have been mentioned in the several separate Indices to the five volumes. Only very eminent writers or authors who wrote several valuable works and papers or were personally consulted are named below.

Abhyankar, Vasudevasastri (M. M. Pandit); Prof. K. V. Abhyankar (son of the preceding); Aiyangar (Krishna), (Prof.) K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, Dr. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar, Dr.

A. S. Altekar, Arthur Avalon (Sir. John Woodroffe), Mr. M. B. Arte, Srī Aurobindo, Prof. P. V. Bapat, Shri. N. C. Bapat, Prof. A. L. Basham, Mr. Y. A. Bhat, Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, Pandit Bhagavad-datta, Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, Prof. G. H. Bhatt, Mr. (and now Dr.) Bhabatosh Bhattacharya, Dr. Benoyatosh Bhattacharya, M. Bloomfield, G. Bühler, A. Burnell, Dr. Caland, Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti, M. M. Cakravarty, Mr. N. G. Chapekar, Mr. M. A. Chinnaswami Sastry, H. T. Colebrooke, A. Coomaraswamy, E. B. Cowell, Dr. K. L. Daftari, Dr. R. N. Dandekar, Dr. Matilal Das, Prof. Das Gupta, Datar Chintaman Sastri, T. W. Rhys Davids, Prof. S. K. De, Paul Deussen, Dr. (Miss) Indu Dike, Mr. D. B. Diskalkar, Mr. P. C. Divanji, Shri R. R. Diwakar, Pandit K. S. Dravid (Sāmaveda expert), Prof. P. E. Dumont, Will Durant, M. N. Dutt, Prof. Edgerton, Julius Eggeling, V. Fausböll, Prof. Filliozat, J. F. Fleet, A. A. Führer, Dr. D. Gaastra, Dr. G. S. Gai, Pandit T. Ganapati Sastri, R. Garbe, G. T. Garrat, Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, Dr. G. S. Ghurye, Prof. P. K. Gode, Prof. N. A. Gore, M. M. Gopinath Kaviraj, G. Gorer, H. H. Gowen, R. T. Griffith, F. Hall, Martin Haug, Dr. R. C. Hazra, A. Hillebrandt, Prof. M. Hiriyanna, Dr. R. Hoernle, Prof. Hopkins, R. E. Hume, Col. G. A. Jacob, H. Jacobi, W. James, K. P. Jayaswal, Dr. Ganganath Jha, Julius Jolly, Dr. B. S. Joshi, Tarkatīrtha Lakṣmaṇa Sāstri Joshi, Mr. S. N, Joshi (Poona), Pandit Kamalkrishna Smrititirtha, Mr. S. L. Katre Dr. S. M. Katre, A. B. Keith, H. Kern, Mr. Kesavan (National Library, Calcutta), Dr. S. V. Ketkar, Swami Kevalānanda, Mr. G. H. Khare, Pandit Balacharya Khuperkar, F. Kielhorn, W. Kirfel, Tarkatīrtha Raghunath Shastri Kokje, Sten Konow, Prof Kunhan Raja, Prof. Kuppuswami Sastri, Shri Kuvalayānanda, Dr. B. C. Law, Sylvain Levi, H. Lüders, A. A. Macdonell, MacTaggart, Dr. R. C. Majumdar, V. N. Mandlik, Prof. Mangal Deva Shastri, Sir R. P. Masani, F. Max-Müller, Dr. V. V. Mirashi, Rajendralal Mitra, Dr. M. M. Umesha Mishra, Dr. R. K. Mukerji, Mr. Y. M. Mulay, Prof. Neugebauer, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, K. L. Ogale, Hermann Oldenberg, Pandit J. S. Pade, Shankar Pandurang Pandit, Prof. A. M. Paramasivanandan, Prof. V. G. Paranjape, Peter Peterson, A. S. Pringle-Pattison, Mr. P. M. Purandare, Dr. A. D. Pusalker, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Ranga. charya Raddi Shastri, Dr. V. Raghavan, V. K. Rajwade, Prof. R. D. Ranade, Prof. P. T. Raju, Prof. L. Renou, R. Roth, Mr. R. S. Sarma. Prof. G. Sarton, Miss Kunda Sathe (now Mrs.

Savkar), P. P. S. Sastri, Pandit Aiyanath Sastri, Dr. Dakshinaranjan Shastri, M. M. Sridhar Sastri Pathak, Satyavrata Sāmaśrami, Mr. S. N. Savadi, Pandit Srījiva Nyāyatīrtha, Pandit V. A. Ramswami Sastri, Pandit S. D. Satavalekar, R. Sham Sastri, V. A. Smith, Prof. P. A. Sorokin, Dr. Sternbach, Pandit Sudhakar Dwivedi, Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, Dr. A. Schweitzer, W. W. Tarn, C. H. Tawney, R. H. Tawney, K. T. Telang, G. Thibaut, K. P. Trivedi, Prof. A. N. Upadhye, Prof. H. D. Velankar, Swami Vivekānanda, Prof. A. R. Wadia, A. Weber, H. G. Wells, W. D. Whitney, Monier Williams, H. H. Wilson, M. Winternitz, R. C. Zaehner, H. Zimmer.

I beg to be pardoned if, through loss of memory, I have omitted the names of persons to whom I have been indebted for advice, guidance or information.

INDEX (to vol. V)

a. = author ; Acc. = According ; M = mentioned by or in ;
Q. = quoted by or in

(Important and rare words are put in Italics)